Andhra University Series, No. 32:

A Forgotten Chapter of Andhra History

(History of the Musunūri Nāyaks)

BY

M. SOMASEKHARA SARMA

(Department of History, Economics and Politics, Andhra University)

PRINTED AT THE

ANANDA PRESS, MADRAS

All Rights Reserved] 1945 [Price: Rs. 2/-.

[56|42—14-4-45—250 Copies]

08

Andhra University Series, No. 32:

1608

A Forgotten Chapter of Andhra History

(History of the Musunūri Nāyaks)

BY

M. SOMASEKHARA SARMA

(Department of History, Economics and Politics, Andhra University)

PRINTED AT THE

ANANDA PRESS, MADRAS

1945

FOREWORD.

The reconstruction of the *Political* History of India has passed through three stages: at first scholars were content to piece together an account of Imperial dynasties; next they took to the writing of local histories; and very recently they have begun to concentrate upon the annals of petty principalities. This process has been largely due to the gradual realisation of the fact that no authentic and comprehensive account of India's past could be written without a thorough insight into all historical currents even in the remotest corners of India. In the course of their investigation they found that apparently insignificant and parochial events often gave birth to forces which fixed the direction of future history.

One such event is the resolute action of a band of Andhra patriots in the third decade of the fourteenth century. When the Turkish Sultans of Delhi had overthrown practically all the Hindu kingdoms of South India and the country was groaning under the alien rule, these patriots rose in revolt, and in the face of overwhelming odds succeeded in winning the freedom of their land. Their achievement inspired others, and ultimately through the exertions of the founders of the Empire of Vijayanagara the Turkish dominion in the South was completely eliminated. The details of this epic struggle, its genesis and nature, remained for long shrouded in mystery. Due to the paucity of materials and erroneous statements of Barani and Ferishta, the very identity of the original leaders of this war of liberation remained unknown, and, until Mr. M.S. Sarma disproved the story, it was wrongly accepted on all hands that this movement was headed by Kanyā Nāyak or Kṛṣṇa Nāyak, a son of Kākatiya Pratāparudra.

Mr. M. S. Sarma commenced the study of inscriptions as a hobby some three decades back and to-day he occupies an eminent place among the South Indian epigraphists. In recognition of his talents the Andhra University appointed him as Pandit in Epigraphy and South Indian Archaeology. To him belongs the credit of

shattering this myth of Pratāparudra's son, and identifying 'Kanyā Nāyak' with Kāpaya Nāyak of Gaṇapēśvaram and Pillalamaṛṛi inscriptions as early as 1931 in the *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*. Since then he has found ample support for his theory in Vilasa and Prōlavaram grants. Indeed he rescued the former document from oblivion and published it in the *Bhārati* in 1942. Having done so much research, it was but natural for him to take up the writing of a connected account of the entire revolutionary movement. The fruits of his labour are gathered in this brochure entitled '*A Forgotten Chapter of Andhra History*.'

No doubt this stirring episode has been well rendered by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya in his '*Early Muslim Expansion in South India*' published by the Madras University in 1942. But the publication of Mr. Sarma's work, however, need not be taken as mere duplication. While Mr. Venkataramanayya's work presents the results of his 'investigation of the circumstances under which the great Hindu Empire of Vijayanagara came to be established', Mr. Sarma's monograph is mainly concerned with the war of independence in the Andhra Country. The works of the two scholars are complementary and constitute a solid contribution to the study of inter-statal relations and clash of ideals during this period of Turkish occupation of South India.

Mr. Sarma's scholarly work will be a powerful stimulant to the Andhras of the present generation and will prove of permanent value to all historians of India.

Andhra University Colleges,
GUNTUR,
Dated 30th Jan., 1945

GURTY VENKET RAO

PREFACE.

As originally designed, this brochure formed the introductory chapter of my forthcoming work, '*History of the Reḍḍi Kingdoms.*' It contained many points to be clarified and established and also fresh information furnished by copper-plate grants newly discovered and as yet unpublished. Chief among such records is the Vilasa grant of the Musunūri Chief, Prōlaya Nāyaka, a unique document containing much interesting information not otherwise available. By its very nature this chapter had grown so big that I was afraid it would be disproportionate to the other parts of my book. So I thought of making it a separate publication which would also enable me to present to the public the new information contained in the Vilasa record without any delay. However, it was not possible to issue this work as early as I expected. Though in Press in 1942, the paper famine and war conditions prevailing in the country prevented it from seeing the light of day till now.

This work '*A Forgotten Chapter of Andhra History*' commencing from 1323 A. D., the year of the fall of the Kākatīya Capital of Warangal, mainly deals with the history of the Musunūri Nāyaks, Prōlaya Nāyaka and Kāpaya Nāyaka who respectively freed the coastal Andhra country and the upland Telingānā from the Muslim yoke and re-established Hindu supremacy. Prōlaya Nāyaka was the first Telugu chief to rule the coastal region of the Andhra country independently during the early post-Kākatiya period. His cousin and successor Kāpaya Nāyaka made Warangal his capital after its re-conquest and ruled the country for about thirty years.

The members of the Pākanāṭi family of the Reḍḍi Kings who had their capital first at Addaṇki and later on at Koṇḍaviḍu, were originally subordinate to the Musunūri Nāyaks and silently carved out a principality for themselves while owing allegiance to them, and later on, asserted their independence. This work therefore forms the prologue to the political drama enacted by the Reḍḍi

Kings of Koṇḍaviḍu in the mediaeval period, subsequent to the fall of Warangal. In fact this work may be rightly termed as the first part of my forthcoming work '*History of the Reḍḍi Kingdoms.*'

I offer my sincere thanks to the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate of the Andhra University for sanctioning the publication of this work under University auspicies and to Prof. M. Venkatarangayya, and Sri Gurty Venket Rao, Reader in History for kindly finding time to peruse the manuscript and offering valuable suggestions in the midst of their onerous duties. I am much indebted to Dr. N. Venkataramanayya of the Madras University for translating for me some passages from the Persian Work *Tārīkh-ī-Ferishta* and correcting some proofs of this work. I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Vidvān D. Venkataramana Sāstri (Pandit in Telugu, Andhra University) in correcting and elucidating the texts of some inscriptions bearing on this history.

Despite the care I have taken some printing mistakes have crept into this work for which I crave the indulgence of the reading public.

GUNTUR,
Dec. 1944.

M. SOMASEKHARA SARMA.

ABBREVIATIONS.

A. M. B.	Andhra Mahā Bhāratam.
A. R. E.	Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy.
A. S. P. P.	Āndhra Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrika.
Bhp.	Bhīmēśvara Purāṇam by Śrīnātha.
E. C.	Epigraphia Carnatica.
E. D.	History of India by Sir H. M. Elliot.
E. I.	Epigraphia Indica.
E. I. M.	Epigraphia Indo-Moslemica.
Ep. Coll.	Epigraphical Collection.
H. A. R.	Annual Report on Archaeology, Hyderabad.
I. A. / Ind. Ant.	Indian Antiquary.
I. T. D. N. D.	A corpus of inscriptions in the Telingānā districts of H. E. H. the Nizam's Dominions.
J. B. O. R. S.	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.
J. O. R.	Journal of Oriental Research.
J. R. A. S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Kk. S.	Kākatiya Sancika.
L. R. / Loc. Rec.	Local Records.
Mack. Mss.	Mackenzie Manuscripts.
N. D. I.	Inscriptions in the Nellore District, published by Butterworth and Vēṇugōpāla Chetty.
PP.	Padma Purāṇam by Maḍiki Singana.
Sc. A. R.	Annual Report on Archaeology, Southern Circle.
S. I. I.	South Indian Inscriptions.
Vs. R.	Vāṣiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇam by Maḍiki Singana.
VV.	Velugōṭivāri Vamśāvaḷi.
VVc.	Velugōṭivāri Vamśacaritra.

CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

Page 1,	line 21:	*read*	'did not lose.'
„ 4,	„ 2:	*read*	'phenomenal.'
„ 5,	„ 16:	*read*	'was sent by way of.'
„ 8,	„ 25:	*read*	'monarch, who had led.'
„ 18,	„ 11:	*read*	'of King Saṅgama.'
„ 20,	„ 6:	*read*	'country.'
„ „	„ 10:	*read*	'abandoned.'
„ 21,	„ 6:	*read*	'to the Andhras.'
„ 25,	„ 21:	*read*	'Maqbūl.'
„ 26,	„ 16:	*read*	'conquered the Southern.'
„ 29,	„ 25:	*read*	'It is said that he.'
„ 31,	„ 28:	*read*	'which was submerged.'
„ 32,	„ 25:	*read*	'who is said to have been.'
„ 35,	„ 7:	*read*	'and yet to be able.'
„ 38,	„ 17:	*read*	'did not lose.'
„ 40,	„ 29:	*read*	'necessity for replacing.'
„ 51,	„ 10:	*read*	'Neby.'
„ 52,	„ 17:	*read*	'Neby.'
„ 56,	„ 6:	*read*	'Nāyaṇḍu.'
„ 94,	„ 20:	*read*	'cāṭu.'
„ 95,	„ 20:	*read*	'(kalukōṭalu).'

CONTENTS.

			Page
Foreword		...	i
Preface		...	iii
Abbreviations		...	v
Section I.	The fall of Warangal	...	1
„ II.	Plight of the country	...	20
„ III.	The new leadership	...	25
„ IV.	The beginning of the Hindu revival	...	35
„ V.	The re-conquest of Warangal	...	47
„ VI.	The reign of Kāpaya Nāyaka	...	70

APPENDICES.

Appendix I.	The Vilasa grant of Prōlaya Nāyaka	...	100
„ II.	Extract from the Kaluvacēru grant of Anitalli	...	111
„ III.	The Prōlavaram grant of Kāpaya Nāyaka	...	113
„ IV.	The order and chronology of the campaigns of the Bahmani Sultan Muhammad Shāh I	...	118
„ V(*a*)	Genealogy of the Musunūri Nāyaks	...	133
„ V(*b*)	Chronology of the Bahmani Sultans of Gulbarga	...	133

Section I

THE FALL OF WARANGAL

The Kākatīya monarchs of Warangal or Ekaśilānagara who began their political career as subordinates of the Western Cāḷukyas of Kalyāṇi by obtaining Anumakoṇḍa *viṣaya*[1] as a feudal fief from Trailōkyamalla, gradually rose to power and set up their independent rule when the Cāḷukyan power was on the wane. At the time when they were building up their power and acquiring considerable influence on the politics of the land, Andhra or the Telugu country was politically under several chiefs, each ruling his own dominion as a sovereign prince. The coastal districts were under the rule of some local chiefs who rose to power first as subordinates of the Cāḷukya-Cōḷas of Kāñcī. During the period of the rule of the Kākatīya kings, Prōla II and his son Rudradēva the Cāḷukya-Cōḷas nominally exercised their authority over these feudatory chiefs and left them more or less to themselves as they were busy with their own affairs in the South, and unable therefore to control their vassals from such a remote place as Kāñcī, their capital. These local dynasties, often at war with one another, did not loose any opportunity to extend their dominion at the expense of their weak neighbours. Just at this juncture the Kākatīyas tried to take advantage of the situation in the coastal region of the Andhra country and extend their power as far as the sea in

1. Kāzipet Dargāh inscription of Bēta II, I.T.D.N.D., Part II, No. 7, pp. 25 ff.

the east. Their attempts were crowned with success during the rule of Gaṇapatidēva. He carried his arms as far as Kaḷiṅga in the north, the Bay of Bengal in the east, and Kāñcī in the south, reducing all the kings who were ruling within these limits into submission in order to bring the entire Andhra country under a single umbrella. It is not unlikely that he was actuated by this idea as a result of his having foreseen that South India would, sooner or later, be confronted with the danger of Muslim invasions.

The new spirit that was pervading throughout the length and breadth of the Telugu country, during the latter half of the twelfth century, just before the commencement of the reign of Gaṇapatidēva, probably found expression in the term ' Andhra ' which was freely and frequently used in those days. Not only Vēngī but the whole of the country inhabited by the people speaking the Telugu language came to be called the Andhra country, in preference to the practice till then prevailing of calling different portions of the country by different territorial names like Vēngī, Velanāḍu, Pākanāḍu etc. Andhra was the external symbol of the idea that the whole country was one indivisible unit. The people were Andhras, the country was Andhra, and the King was *Andhranarēśvara*. For the first time in their history the race-consciousness of the people was awakened. Tikkana Sōmayāji, one of the greatest of the Telugu poets and a contemporary of Gaṇapatidēva was also swayed probably by that new spirit when he stated in one of his introductory verses in the *Virāṭaparva* of the *Andhra Mahābhārata*, that he was translating the Sanskrit *Mahābhārata* into Telugu in order that the

entire Andhra populace might derive pleasure.[2] The *Nāṭaka-prakaraṇa* in the *Pratāparudrīya*, a Sanskrit work on rhetoric written by Vidyānātha and dedicated to Pratāparudra, one of the successors of Gaṇapatidēva, breathes the same new spirit when his warriors were addressed as *Andhra-kṣamā-bhṛd-bhaṭāḥ* and the king as *Andhra-kṣam-ādhīśvara* and *Triliṅga-dēśa-paramēś-vara* and the like.[3] All these instances reveal to us that there was a new orientation of ideas and ideals and that a new spirit pervaded throughout the Telugu country during the early Kākatīya period. Probably,

2. " కావున భారతామృతము కర్ణపుటంబుల నారఁ గ్రోలి యాం
ధ్రావలి మోదముం బొరయునట్లుగ సాత్యవతేయ సంస్కృతి
శ్రీవిభవాస్పదంబయిన చిత్తముతోడ మహాకవిత్వదీ
క్షావిధి నొంది పద్యముల గద్యములన్ రచియించెదం గృతుల్.

A. M. B., *Virāṭaparva*, Canto. I., V. 30.

3. Vide, the *Nāṭaka-prakaraṇa* in the *Pratāparudrīya* of Vidyānātha. The address of the king as *Triliṅgadēśa-paramēśvara* seems to be incorrect. The Andhra country during the early fourteenth century was called 'Tiliṅga' and not 'Triliṅga'. The Vilasa grant of Prōlaya Nāyaka refers to the country as Tiliṅga.

" *Varṣē ca tasmin kamanīya-vāsas-*
Tiliṅganāmo sa cakāsti dēśaḥ " ;
" *Tailiṅgam dharaṇi-talam etc.*"

The work *Pratāparudrīya* also must have used originally the form 'Tiliṅga', and not 'Triliṅga'. Hence, the address must have been " *Tiliṅga-dēśa-paramēśvara.*" The form 'Triliṅga' came into use at a still later date. The Muslim Chroniclers also call the country Tiliṅga, Teliṅga or Teliṅgānā. Even the Śrīrangam plates of Mummaḍi Nāyaka, dated Śaka 1280, refer to the country as 'Tiliṅga'—(*Dēśa-sma tatr-āsti Tiliṅga nāmā.*—E. I., XIV, p. 90, v. 5. But it must be pointed out here that the form 'Triliṅga' was used in the Akkalapūṇḍi grant of Siṅgaya Nāyaka, brother of Mummaḍi Nāyaka—(*Tēṣāṁ Śirōbhūṣaṇam-ēva dēśas-Trilinganāmā sukṛtaikasīmā* ", v. 10—E. I, XIII, p. 262). This shows that the form " Triliṅga ' came into use in the latter half of the fourteenth century.

this new spirit was not a little responsible for Gaṇapatidēva's phenominal success in his campaigns against Kāñcī and Kaḷinga.

For a little more than a century from the time of Gaṇapatidēva till the end of the rule of the last Kākatīya monarch Pratāparudra, the Kākatīyas were able to maintain their hold on almost the entire Andhra country with the exception of Kaḷiṅga. Bīdar and Kaulas in the west, Simhāchalam and Māhūr in the north and Conjeevaram and Vallūr near Gaṇḍikōṭa in the south were the boundaries of their kingdom. 'Abdu-llah Wassāf, a Muslim historian who lived in the beginning of the fourteenth century says "that this country was populous and replete with every kind of wealth", and contained "more than 30,000 tracts of country".[4] The Muslim chroniclers call this country Tilinga, Telinga or Telingānā, and its capital 'Arangal'. "On all sides of it (Arangal)", they write, "for the distance of two *mīls*, there were fountains and gardens, calculated to gratify those who are in search of pleasure. All its fruits were mangoes, plantains and jacks ; . . . . All the flowers . . . were Hindu ; the *champa*, *keora*, and jasmine "[5]

It was from the last decade of the thirteenth century that the Muslim invaders focussed their attention on the independent Hindu Kingdoms of the South. In the reign of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī, Malik Nāib Kāfūr led, according to the Muslim chroniclers, successful expeditions to the Deccan country and even advanced as far as Sētuband

4. 'Abdu-llah Wassāf *Tazjiyatu-l Amsār*, E. D., III, p. 49.

5. Amīr Khusrau—*Nuh Ṣipihr*,-E.D., III, p. 559.

Rāmēśvar[6], where he planted a pillar of victory. These invasions were, further, continued by the successors of 'Alā-ud-dīn on the throne of Delhi. As a result of these invasions the Hindu Kingdoms of the South were ultimately overthrown and the Deccan was brought under Muslim rule.

Muslim historians give us to understand that there were in all five invasions directed against Telingānā. It was in 702 A. H. (1302-03 A. D.) during the reign of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī that Telingānā was invaded for the first time by the Muslims.[7] 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī, the emperor of Delhi sent Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn Jūnā, later on known as Muḥammad bin Tughlaq, and Malik-chchajju of Karra "with all the officers and forces of Hindustan against Arangal."[8] According to Ferishta the army was sent by the way of Bengal.[9] The expedition was a failure. Zia-ud-dīn Barnī informs us of the result of this invasion as follows: "On their arrival there (Arangal)

---

6. *Ferishta*, Vol. I, p. 374. This is not the Rāmēśvaram on the gulf of Mannar, (*Ibid* fn).

7. Yāḥya and Al Badāūnī furnish this date. According to Ferishta it was undertaken just about the time of the invasion of Chittoor (Mēwāḍ), which was reduced in 703 A. H. Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad and Barnī do not assign any date. Amīr Khusrau and 'Abdu-llah Wassāf do not at all allude to this invasion.

8. Zia-ud-dīn Barnī—*Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhī* (E. D. III, p. 189.) Fakhr-ud-dīn Jūnā is no other than Ulugh Khān, son of Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq.

Yāḥya, Ferishta, and Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad do not mention the leader of the expedition. According to Al Badāūnī it was Malik Nāib Kāfūr that was sent on this expedition "with a large army and complete equipment towards Tiling and Marhat" (Mahārāṣṭra)—Vol. I, p. 265.

9. What Al Badāūnī writes is quite opposed to this. He says that the army was sent to reduce Tiling and Marhaṭ (Mahārāṣṭra). If Marhaṭ had to be subjugated the army must have proceeded westward and not eastward by way of Bengal. This was an obscure and circutous route to go to Warangal.

the rainy season began, and proved such a hindrance that the army could do nothing, and in the beginning of winter returned, greatly reduced in numbers, to Hindustan."[10]

Again a second expedition was sent by 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī some seven years later, that is, in 709 A.H. (1309–10 A.D.) under the command of Malik Nāib Kāfūr with a large army.[11] This invasion was successful. Pratāparudra "purchased peace by presenting 300 elephants, 7,000 horses, and money and jewels to a large amount; agreeing, at the same time to pay an annual tribute."[12]

---

10. Yāḥya and Al Badāūnī state that this expedition was successful. "The forces", writes Yāḥya, "besieged the fort (Warangal), and laid waste and plundered the surrounding country, that the Rāi of Tiling sought for quarter and having sent elephants and treasure as a present, made his homage" (*Tārīkh-i-Mubārak Shāhī*, p. 78). Al Badāūnī says that an immense quantity of treasure with elephants and horses, jewels and clothes, fell as spoil into the hands of the troops. (*Muntakhab-ut-Tawārikh*, Vol I, p. 265—Translation by Lt. Colonel G. S. A. Ranking). Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad does not say anything about the result of this invasion. The discrepancy in the Muslim accounts of this first invasion clearly proves the unreliability and undependability of the Muslim Chronicles, and serves as a warning to us not to take every statement made therein as gospel truth.

11. All the Muslim Chronicles except *Tārikh-i-Mubārak Shāhī* describe this invasion. It is only Amīr Khusrau in his *Tārikh-i-'Alāi* that furnishes dates with details of the successive stages of the march of the army.

12. According to Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad only one hundred elephants were given besides much treasure and seven thousand horse. Al Badāūnī does not mention the number of elephants given though he says several fine elephants were offered. Wassāf writes "It is related 6,000 *kharwārs* or loads of gold were despatched to Delhi, and in consequence of the abundance of diamonds obtained by plunder, they became so cheap that, one weighing a *miskal*, could be purchased for three *dīnārs*". Amīr Khusrau states that Malik left Warangal "with all his booty" and, "a thousand camels groaned under the weight of the treasure". Zia-ud-dīn Barnī says that Kāfūr took from Rudradēva "all the treasure which he had accumulated in the course of many years, a hundred elephants, seven thousand horse, and large quantities of jewels and valuables."

There is no agreement among the Muslim Chroniclers regarding the third invasion of Telingānā which is said to have taken place during the reign of 'Alā-ud-dīn's son, Mubārak Shāh. No account of this expedition is given by Barnī, Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad and Ferishta. While the first two historians refer only to the invasion of Ma'bar the third refers to that of Malabar. Yāḥya and Al Badāūnī give an account of this invasion. And, *Nuh Sipihr* of Amīr Khusrau furnishes a very detailed account.[13]

Prince Jūnā, entitled Ulugh Khān, the son of Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq, led the fourth invasion in 721 A.H. (1321 A.D.) during the reign of his father. We are told by Zia-ud-dīn Barnī that Pratāparudradēva, having been besieged in the fort of Warangal, was reduced to extremities and that Ulugh Khān was almost sure of his success, when a false report spread among the soldiers to the effect that Sultan, Ghiās-ud-dīn was dead, that the government had been overthrown, and that a new prince sat on the throne of Delhi. This changed the course of the war. As a consequence of these false reports many of the Muslim nobles deserted the army which became considerably thinned in numbers. Ulugh Khān was obliged to raise the siege and he took to flight chased by the Hindus.

"Differences," writes Barnī, "arose among the 'Alāī nobles who had fled from the army; each of them pursued his own course. Their soldiers and servants perished, and their horses and arms fell into the hands of the Hindus. Ulugh Khān reached Deogir in safety.

13. E. D., III, pp. 558–61.

Malik Tamar, with a few horsemen, plunged into the Hindu territories, and perished there. Malik Tigin of Oudh was killed by the Hindus, and his skin was sent to Ulugh Khān at Deogir."[14]

This was the result of the fourth invasion of Telingānā. The failure of this invasion rankled in the mind of Sultan, Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq. With a view to retrieve his honour and prestige and to wreak his vengeance upon the Hindus of Telingānā he sent his son, Ulugh Khān a second time in 735 A.H. (1322 A.D.) with fresh reinforcements to reduce the fort of Warangal. This was the fifth invasion according to Muslim chroniclers.

The year of 1323 A.D., sealed the fate of Warangal. After the final subjugation of the Maharaṭa kingdom the whole weight of Muslim invasion to the South fell on the kingdom of the Kākatīyas of Warangal, who resisted with all their might the fury of the invading forces; but the oft-repeated invasions, no doubt, broke the morale of the Hindus and paved the way for the success of the Muslims. The kingdom of Warangal was finally conquered in 1323 A.D., and brought under subjection by Ulugh Khān. The sun of independence set over the land of the Andhras. Vīrarudra or Pratāparudradēva, the last Kākatīya monarch who led his myriad armies on successful military expeditions to far off countries in the South and won many a stubborn battle, was taken captive and sent to Delhi along with his treasures, family and relations under the charge of Malik Bēdar who had the title Kadr Khān, and Khwājā

14. Zia-ud-dīn Barnī, *Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhi*, E. D., III, p. 233.

Hājee, the Deputy Muster-master of the Empire who were the trusted officers of Ulugh Khān.

Telingānā was annexed to Delhi. Warangal or the proud Andhranagara, as it was called in the heyday of the Kākatīya power, was rechristened Sultānpūr, and placed under the charge of a military official.

The above account is based on Muslim chronicles. Their veracity regarding the number of campaigns and the success which attended them each time has not been tested so far owing to lack of evidence from the Hindu side. But, some of the copper-plate grants which were discovered recently in the coastal Andhra country throw much light on this question. The accounts furnished by these grants differ, in some of their detail, from that given by the Muslim chronicles though the ultimate result is the same according to both. The copper-plate grants[15] of Vilasa, and Kaluvachēṟu allude to Muslim invasions, and describe the state of the Andhra country consequent on the fall of Warangal. According to the Vilasa grant of Prōlaya Nāyaka the emperors of Delhi led eight invasions against Telingānā, and not five as stated by the Muslim chroniclers.[16] In seven out

15. Vide, appendices, Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

16. The *Pratāpacaritra*, a late quasi-historical prose work in Telugu dealing with the history of the Kākatīyas of Warangal also states that there were eight Muslim invasions against Warangal. Pratāparudra was successful in defeating the Mussalmans and driving them away in seven out of the eight invasions. But, in the eighth attack on Warangal he was captured and taken captive to Delhi (A.S.P.P., VII, pp. 304–5). The leader of the last invasion, according to this work, was Fullu Khān which appears to be a mistake for Ulugh Khān. Some of these campaigns were described in detail. But these accounts cannot be taken as trustworthy because this work contains very few historical facts which are inextricably mixed with fiction, and exaggerated

of the eight invasions Pratāparudradēva is said to have defeated the emperor of Delhi who had nine lakhs horse. This is what the Vilasa grant states: while king, Pratāparudra was ruling the country from his capital, Ēkaśilānagara

> "Sultān Aḥammad ("*Ahammadu-Suratrāṇaḥ*"), the lord of the Turuṣkas made great enmity with him (Pratāparudra). Those of the kings who were left of the slain by Jāmadagni Rāma were completely destroyed by him (the Sultan) who was a *laya-kāla* to kings. The powerful Vīrarudra who had excellent brave warriors conquered seven times the Sultan who had nine lakhs horse. But, he, though proficient in political science, though possessed of great strength, and though aided by other kings, came under the control of the lord of the Turuṣkas by the diminution of the fortune of the circle of mankind. While he was being led with special effort by the lord of the

---

accounts of Pratāparudra's campaigns which are not generally supported by his records so far discovered.

Amīr Khusrau states that Sultān, 'Alā-ud-dīn despatched his brother, Ulugh Khān to Ma'bar and Gujarat on the 20th of Jamāda'l awwal, 698 H. (17th February, 1299 A.D.)—*Tārikh-i-'Alāi*, E. D., III, p. 74. Zia-ud-dīn Barnī states that four or five months after Sultan 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī left Rantambhor Ulugh Khān collected a large force with the intention of attacking Tiling and Ma'bar, but died—*Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhi*, E. D., III, p. 179. We do not know if the actual invasion of Tiling was undertaken. No other Muslim Chronicler refers to Ulugh Khān's collection of the army to attack Tiling. Amīr Khusrau is not explicit whether Ulugh Khān actually invaded Ma'bar also in the course of his expedition to Gujarat. If he had led the two expeditions referred to above we are then justified in concluding that there were in all seven invasions counting the invasion of Ma'bar also as an attack on Telingānā.

Yavanas to his city Delhi, he, ordained by fate, reached the habitation of the gods on the bank of the river, Sōmōdbhavā, (that is, Narmadā)".

It has to be pointed out here that the grant referred to above calls the Muslim Emperor of Delhi who waged war with Pratāparudra of Warangal 'Ahammad Sultan' ('*Ahammadu-Suratrāṇaḥ*'). This is obviously a mistake. It is possible that either the engraver of the grant wrongly inscribed 'Ahammadu' for Muḥammad, or it might be entirely due to the confusion of the composer himself.

That the Mussalmans suffered defeat at the hands of the Kākatīyas is substantiated by other eveidence. Annamantri, the grandfather of Beṇḍapūḍi Annamantri to whom the Telugu poem *Bhīmēśvarapurāṇa* was dedicated, and the commander of the elephant forces of Pratāparudra, is referred to as the destructive fire in annihilating the *yavanas* (Mussalmans).[17] Another general, Annaya, son of *Mahāpradhāni* Gannaya Preggaḍa is said to have conquered the Turukas or Mussalmans, and defended Pratāparudra's fort (Warangal).[18] Kolani

---

17. "యవనసంహార విలయకాలాగ్ని యనఁగ
...వినుతికెక్క, నతులబలసీరి పోలయ యన్నశౌరి."
Bhp. Canto 1, V. 48.

18. "ఓపి తురుకల గెల్చి ప్రతాపరుద్ర
మనుజనాయకు కోట నేమరక కాచె."
Śivayōgasāram, v. 42—published in Kk. S.

"నా[సులతా నోరుగల్లైన] చుట్టుముట్టనె
తుక్కవలీల్లఁ దాని [కోల్కొ]టఁ గాచె"—*Ibid.*

Rudradēva, son of Manma Ganna also is credited to have slain the *yavanas*,[19] and protected the stone-fort (*kalu-kōṭa*) so as to win the approbation of the Kākatēśa or Pratāparudra. Ēcā Nāyaka, son of Er̤a Dācā Nāyaka of the Rēcerla family who was a subordinate of Pratāparudra defeated the Turukas (Mussalmans) in the battle

---

"(సుసురుబాదోరు గొల్లెన ?) చుట్టుముట్టి నె
క్కువలీల దాని కీల్కోటఁ గాచె"—*Subhāṣi*, Oct., 1927.

The above lines are from the introduction of the Telugu work *Śivayōgasāra* by Kolani Gaṇapatidēva of the 14th century. The introductory verses of this work which are full of interest to the students of history were printed as an appendix to the *Kākatīya, Sañcika* published by the Āndhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry. The late, C. Virabhadrarao, the author of The History of the Āndhras in Telugu, contributed, long before the publication of the *Kākatīya Sañcika*, an article entitled *Śivayōgasāramu, Vinta-caritrāṁśamulu* to the October number of the *Subhāṣi* in 1927, in which he quoted the relevant verses extensively. All the information regarding the Kolani family is only taken from the verses from *Śivayōgasāram*, which were published in the *Kākatīya Sañcika* and in the article by the late C. Virabhadrarao.

The last two lines quoted above are faulty. They should be emended as follows:—

"సులతాను దగ నోరుగలు చుట్టుముట్ట నె
క్కువలీలఁ దానె కల్కోటఁ గాచె"

The meaning of the two lines is this : When the Sultan came and besieged Ōrugal (Warangal) he (Annaya, son of Gannaya Preggaḍa of the Kolani family) himself defended the stone fort. Ziā-ud-dīn Barnī refers to this stone fort (*Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhī*, E. D., III, p. 202).

19. "కాకితేశుఁడు మెచ్చఁ గలుకోట వెసఁ గాచి
యవనేశులను దున్మినట్టి యితఁడు"

—*Śivayōgasāram*, Kk. S. p. 56.

of Kōlacalama, and brought many horses as booty.[20] The chiefs of Kōsagi in the Gulbarga district, Hyderabad state, claim to have plundered the seven constituents of royalty of Ulugh Khān, probably during his first invasion of Warangal in 1321 A. D.[21] There is yet another, still earlier reference to the defeat of the Mussalmans. Siṅghaṇadēva's son, Śārṅgapāṇidēva of the Yādava dynasty who was ruling the Pānuṅgal country as a vassal of the Kākatīyas of Warangal is given the significant title "*Turuṣk-ōpaplava-mēdinī-samuddharaṇa-mahā-varāha*" ("one who is the great Boar incarnation in lifting the Earth out of the Muhammadan deluge") in an inscription[22] dated Śaka 1189 or 1266 A.D., which suggests that he defeated the Turuṣkas. This date, it may be noted, is twenty-eight years earlier than that of the earliest campaign of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī against the Deccan, that is, of the first invasion of Dēvagiri. All the above references prove that the Hindus also waged some successful wars with the Mussalmans and drove them away.

The Hindu account furnished by the Vilasa grant appears to be more trustworthy than the Muslim

---

20. "వీరుం డా యేచపృథ్వీవిభుఁ డ[తులభుజా]విక్రమన్యక్కృ[తాన్య
స్ఫారుం డై] మచ్చగన్న ప్రముఖనృపతులన్ బ్రాణము ల్వాపి హెచ్చెన్
[న్యోరాజత్]ఖడ్గధారన్ దునిమెఁ దురకలం దోలి తత్సైన్యరాజీ
ఘోరాజీధాటి చెల్లన్ గొలచలమపురిన్ ఘోటికాకోటిఁ దెచ్చెన్."
—VV. v. 48, p. 14.

21. "ఉలుఘుఖాన సప్తాంగహరణ"—Mac. Mss, 15-5-32.

22. Panugal inscription of Śārṅgapāṇidēva, I. T. D. N. D., Part II, No. 34, pp. 98ff.

accounts for the following reason. The former admits that the last invasion was a thorough success to the Mussalmans, and states that Pratāparudra was taken captive, and sent to Delhi. We learn further from this account that he did not reach the imperial capital, Delhi, but committed suicide on the banks of the river, Narmadā, on the way to Delhi, having been probably over-powered with grief and humiliation. This appears to be the real import of the statement in the Kaluvacēṟū grant of Anitalli that Pratāparudra departed to the world of gods at his own free will—" *tasmin Pratāparudrē-svasthānam svēcchay-aiva yātavati*". The above fact is corroborated by one of the Muslim chroniclers. Shams-i-Ṣirāj 'Afif, the author of *Tārikh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī* says that when Sultan Muḥammad sent the Rai of Telingānā to Delhi he died on the road.[23]

Ulugh Khān, as if to make the conquest of the Telugu country complete, undertook an expedition, by way of Rājamahēndravaram, to Orissa or Jājnagar[24] of

---

23. Shams-i-Ṣirāj 'Afif, *Tārikh-i-Firūz Shāhi*, E. D. III, p. 367.

The dates of the capture of Pratāparudra and of his death were furnished by the *Pratāpacaritra*. According to this work Pratāparudra was taken captive in the cyclic year, Rudhirōdgāri, on Thursday, the second *tithi* of the dark fortnight of the month of Āśvīja (A. S. P. P., VII, p. 305). The cyclic, year, Rudhirōdgāri tallies with Śaka 1245 or 1323 A.D. The month of Āśvīja corresponds to September. The date is, however, irregular since ba. di 2 does not fall on Thursday, as given in the work, but on Saturday according to the *Indian Ephemeris*.

The date of Pratāparudra's death is Rudhirōdgāri, Māgha śu. di 5, Thursday. According to the *Indian Ephemeris* this date also is irregular. The week day does not tally with the *tithi* given.

24. Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad, the author of the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* says that 'Jājnagar is situated on the border of the country of Kara Katankah (Amarakaṇṭaka ?) "—p. 247 (Translation).

the Muslim chroniclers, the kingdom of the Eastern Gāṅga monarchs, whence he is reported to have returned victorious with forty elephants. This statement, however, is not substantiated by any other Hindu record, either literary or epigraphical. Besides referring to Ulugh Khān's conquest of Jājnagar[25] the Muslim historians state that it was also annexed to Delhi, like Telingānā. Ṣirāj-al-Dīn Abal Fatḥ 'Umar, another Muslim writer enumerates twenty-three provinces in the empire of Delhi, of which Jājnagar is one[26]. But Barnī does not include it in the provinces of Delhi. It may, however, be pointed out here that for a period of four years from Śaka 1245 or 1323 A.D., the year of the fall of Warangal to Śaka 1249 or 1327 A.D., no records

25. "According to *Masālik-ul-Abṣār* Sheikh Mubārak-ul-Anbātī relates, "the first place which was conquered was the country of Tilink (Tiling): It is an extensive province with many villages—the number of which is nine hundred thousand and nine hundred. Then the province of Jājnagar was conquered which has seventy big cities all (situated) on the sea coast. Its sources of revenue are pearls, different kinds of cloth, perfumes and scents. Then he conquered the province of Lakhnauti which had been the seat of nine kings. Then he conquered the province of Devagir, also known as Dakīn. It has 84 strong hill forts. It is related on the authority of Sheikh Burhānuddīn Abū Bakr bin al-Khallāl al-Bazi that there are one crore and two lakh villages in it. Then he conquered the province of Dursamand where Sultan Bilāl Deo and five infidel kings reigned. Then he conquered the Province of Ma'bar. It is a big district having ninety ports on the sea coast. Perfumes, Muslin (*lānis*), various kinds of cloth and other beautiful things are its sources of revenue[90]."—Quoted from Al-Qalqashandi's Ṣubḥ ul-A'shā.

Al-Qalqashandi "came from a learned family of Qalqashanda, a small place in the district of Qalyūb near cairo. The date of his birth is not certain, probably it was 758 or 756. . . . . He died, nearly 65 years of age, on the 10th Jumādā 'l-ākhira 821 A. H.=July 16th, 1418 A.D." The chapters on India from his work translated by Otto Spies were published in "*the Muslim University Journal*" (June number of 1935) under the title "*An Arab account of India* in the fourteenth century". The passage quoted above was taken from it. (Vide pages, 62 and 63).

26. E. D., III, p. 576.

of the Gāṅga monarchs of Kaḷiṅga have so far come to light. Even if the absence of inscriptions of the Gāṅga rulers in the period stated above is regarded as indicating the Muslim conquest of Kaḷiṅga it must be admitted that it had recovered its independence in or before Śaka 1249 or 1327 A.D.; for, there is enough of epigraphical evidence to prove that the Gāṅga monarchs were ruling independently Kaḷiṅga and Utkal from that date.[27] These considerations suggest that the expedition of Ulugh Khān to Jājnagar must have been in the nature of a military raid or a punitive expedition probably to punish the Rājā of Jājnagar for some help he might have rendered to Pratāparudra in his fight with the Mussalmans.

Anyhow, whether the conquest of Jājnagar is true or not, the fact can not be denied that the whole of the Andhra country including the coastal region below the Ghats came under the power of the Muslims. This is confirmed by a Persian record of Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq which was inscribed on the main gate way of the principal mosque in Rājamahēndravaram in the East Godavari district. This inscription which records the construction of that mosque by Sālar 'Ulwī, a servant of Ulugh Khān, runs thus:

> " (It) is the abode of God.
>
> During the reign of the great Sulṭān, Ghiyāthu'd Dunya (waddīn) . . . . Abu'(l Muzaffar)

27. S. I. I., Vol. V, No. 1213. This record furnishes the date Ś. 1252 which corresponds to the fourth year (Aṅka) of the reign of Narasimha III. This proves that he was ruling from Śaka 1249.

Tughlaq Shāh, the Sulṭān (may God perpetuate his kingdom and sovereignty and elevate his authority and dignity!), and during the ever-increasing prosperity (*i.e.*, prosperous regime) of the Khān of the world, Ulugh Khān, the humble servant soliciting the mercy of God . . . . Sālār (?) 'Ulwī, built this mosque on the 20th of the auspicious month of Ramazān (may its blessings be universal!) in 724 H. (Monday, 10th September, 1324 A.D.)"[28]

Fresh corroborative evidence in proof of the Muslim conquest of the coastal region of the Andhra country has recently come to light. Some coins of Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq have been discovered in a village in the Ellore taluk, West Godavari district[29]. The dates on them range from 722 H., to 726 H., that is, from 1322 A.D. to 1326 A.D. From this it is evident that Ghiās-ud-dīn's coins were current in the coastal region of the Andhra country after its conquest by Ulugh Khān.

Besides Telingānā, Ma'bar, which, according to Wassāf, another Muslim historian of the early fourteenth century, extended from 'Nilāwar' (Nellore) to 'Kulam' (Quilon)[30], was also conquered in 1323 A.D. According to the *Pāṇḍyan Chronicle* the date of the Muslim conquest

28. E. I. M., 1923–24, pp. 13–14.

29. This discovery has not yet been brought to the notice of research scholars. Since I happen to get hold of some of these coins through the kind courtesy of a friend of mine I was able to examine them. All the coins are of the same size, and belong to Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq. This type of coins was already described in the coin catalogues.

30. 'Abdu-llah Wassāf, *Tazjiyatu-l Amsār*, E. D., III, p. 32.

of Madura (Ma'bar) is 1323 A.D.[31] After this conquest Ma'bar, like Teliṅgānā, became a province of the Empire of Delhi. The conquest of Ma'bar made the subjugation of the whole of the coastal region of the Andhra country complete.

There is yet another piece of evidence to show that the country around Nellore came under the rule of the Mussalmans. A *cāṭu* verse[32] in Telugu which has been current in the Telugu country refers to kings who had successively held sway over Nellore from the time of Tirukāḷadēva down to the time of king, Saṅgama. The *cāṭu* verse may be assigned to the latter half of the fourteenth century since it was addressed to king Saṅgama of Nellore who was no doubt prince Saṅgama II, son of Kampa I of the first dynasty of

---

31. N. Venkataramanayya, M.A., Ph.D.,—Ma'bar (From 1311 to 1323 A.D.), J.O.R., XII, p. 212.

32. "ధీరుఁడై ధర యేలెఁ దిరుకాళదేవుండు
తిక్కనాయకుఁ డేలెఁ దేజ మెసఁగ
మన్మసిద్ధన యేలె మహిమతో దీపించి
దాది నాగన యేలె ధర్మరీతి
మనుగండ గోపాల మనుజాధిపతి యేలె
స్వర్ణదేవుం డతిప్రభగ నేలె
గోపినాథుం డేలె గుణపయోరాశియై
రమణతో శ్రీరంగరమణుఁ డేలె
ముప్పడి తగ నేలె ముదముతోఁ దురు కేలె
తిక్కన యొక కొన్ని దినము లేలె
నేలె మీతండ్రి మర్యాద లెల్లఁ గలుగఁ
గడక నీ వేలి తందఱుకంటె మించి
శరధిగంభీర ! సంగమక్ష్మాతలేంద్ర."—Mac. Mss.

Vijayanagara. Since it says that the Turuka ruled Nellore immediately after the rule of Muppaḍi, that is, Muppaḍi Nāyaka, one of the ministers of Pratāparudra whose records[33] are found in Nellore till 1314–15 A.D., the Turuka rule must necessarily refer to the Muslim rule after the conquest of Warangal.

Ulugh Khān stayed in Teliṅgānā to consolidate his conquests and organise the adminstration of the country. He appointed *maliks*, *amirs*, and other officers of state and stationed garrisons in important centers. He was summoned to the court when Ghiās-ud-dīn, his father had resolved on an expedition to Lakhnauti in Bengal. On the eve of Ulugh Khān's departure to Delhi, the administration of Telingānā was entrusted in all probability to Malik Burhān-ud-Dīn, the wazīr of Deogir or Daulatabad[34].

---

33. N. D. I, II., N. 80, p. 850 ff.

34. *Tabaqāt-i-Akbari*, Vol. I, p. 209.

SECTION II
PLIGHT OF THE COUNTRY

The Muslim rule in Telingānā was very oppressive and tyrannical. What it was like can be better understood from the contemporary account furnished by the Vilasa grant of Prōlaya Nāyaka or Prōlānēḍu of the Musunūri family which thus describes the piteous condition of the people in the subjugated country.

> "In a hundred sinful ways," says the grant, "the rich were tortured for the sake of money. Merely on beholding the Pārasīkas (Mussalmans) some abondoned their lives. Brahmans were disallowed to perform their religious rites and rituals. Temples were destroyed and idols were desecrated and broken. All the *agrahāras*, which had long been in the enjoyment of the most learned, were taken away. Forcibly deprived of the fruits of their cultivation the husband-men, both the rich and the poor, got ruined. In that great calamity people could not regard their money, wives, and other earthly belongings as their own. The wretched *yavanas* (Mussalmans) revelled always in drinking wine, eating cows' flesh, sporting in amour, and killing the brahmans. When such is the case how could the world of living beings exist? Situated as the country was without the possibility of a saviour being conceived even in imagination the land of Tilinga, tormented in this way by those *yavana* warriors who were

exactly like Rākṣasas, was in flames like a forest surrounded by wild fire.[1]"

Coming as it does from the Hindu side the above account must be taken as presenting a true picture of the state of the country after the fall of Warrangal as it appeared to Andhras of the age. A dispassionate study of the relevant facts shows clearly that this is neither exaggerated nor untrue. No doubts need be entertained about the oppressive character of the Muslim rule; the religious fervour and iconoclastic zeal of the Muslim conquerors which were at their height in those days, necessarily involved the adoption of an intolerant policy towards the infidels. As a proof of their destruction of temples no evidence other than the mosque at Rāja-mahēndravaram, referred to above is needed. This is what Alexander Rea, Superintendent of the Archaeological department, Southern circle, writes in one of his annual reports.

"This is one of the oldest of the Muhammadan mosques in the Presidency (Madras), having been built in A.D. 1324 by Muhammad Tughlak Shāh who, after capturing the fort at Kondapalli after six months' continuous trouble, entered a temple here, and after massacring some of the officiating brahmin priests, had this mosque built on the ruins of the desolated pagoda, and began to establish Muhammadan worship there. The main door-way of finely carved black-stone with inscriptions in Persian,

1. Vide, appendix No. 1.

Hindustani, and Arabic, belonged to the Hindu temple. The small Hindu figures of *dvāra-pālakas* have been chiselled off the lower niches on each side of the door, thus leaving the floral ornament only, untouched. The pillars in the front portico are all parts of the Hindu temple, as also the inside of the covering. The tank resorvoir in the interior was once the sanctum of the Hindu temple, over which the mosque has been built. The great portico just behind this where Muhammadan worship is now being held, also has some ornamental granite pillars of the Hindu temple with the rest in Hindu style. This is a good example of a Hindu temple which retains its original features and has been converted into a Muhammadan mosque. The entrance to the stone-roofed varandah in the east with massive stone Hindu piers has cracks on side walls. . . . . The main part of the mosque stands at the west end of the court. It has an arcade of seven pointed arches in front and two longitudinal rows of Hindu pillars inside.[2]"

Though Rea's account is not quite accurate, it cannot be gainsaid that Muḥammad bin Tughlaq converted an important Hindu temple into a mosque to symbolise the victory of the faithful over the infidels. According to traditional accounts it was originally the temple of Vēṇugōpālasvāmin, built by an Eastern Cāḷukyan monarch of Vēṅgī. It is likely that many of

2. Sc. A. R., 1910-11, pp. 18-19.

the temples of the Cāḷukyan and Kākatīya periods in Telingānā shared the same fate as the above one. That the mosques at Ellore, West Godavari district, and at Bikkavol, East Godavari district were originally Hindu temples is attested to by the Hindu epigraphs there. It is natural that the Mussalmans who, according to the Vilasa grant, suffered defeat seven times at the hands of the Hindus of Telingānā, were ruthless, oppressive and revengeful. The statements regarding ryots and agriculture in the Vilasa grant stand favourable comparison with those made by the contemporary writer Zia-ud-dīn Barnī. He writes as follows:

> "The first project which the Sultan formed, and which operated to the ruin of the country and the decay of the people, was that he thought he ought to get ten or five per cent. more tribute from the lands in the Doab. To accomplish this he invented some oppressive *abwabs* (cesses), and made stoppages from the land-revenues until the backs of the *raiyats* were broken. The cesses were collected so rigorously that the *raiyats* were impoverished and reduced to beggary. Those who were rich and had property became rebels; the lands were ruined, and cultivation was entirely arrested."[3]

The above passage refers to the condition of *raiyats* in the Doab country. Yet, it shows that it is not a whit different from what prevailed then in the Andhra country.

---

3. E. D., III, p. 238.

Discontent and distress prevailed everywhere. People were no longer able to bear the oppressive and tyrannical regime of the Muslim *amīrs*, and other officers. No member of any of the ancient royal families dared to take up the cause of the Hindus and their religion and lead them to success. All the mighty kingdoms of old crumbled down and all the royal families of yore were swept away by the frequent Muslim invasions.

Section III.

THE NEW LEADERSHIP.

Almost all the valiant generals, ministers, and officers of Pratāparudra known to us from his records had been either killed or taken prisoners[1] on the battle-field. Only three of the old generals survived the catastrophe. They are Annamantri, Kolani Rudradēva or Pratāparudra and Rēcerla Siṅgama Nāyaka or Siṅgamanēḍu.

Annamantri or Annaya was the *Gaja-sāhiṇi* or the commander of the elephant forces of Kākati Pratāparudradēva. He is described, as stated already,[2] as the veritable fire in annihilating the *yavanas*, and as the establisher of the throne of the *Adhyakṣa*, of the Andhra country. He is also said to have received from Kolani Pratāparudra the village of Ārēḍu as an *agrahāra* at the time of a solar eclipse.[3]

---

1. Shams-i-Ṣirāj 'Afif gives a short account of a Hindu, probably an officer of Pratāparudra, who was taken captive in this war. He was, according to 'Afif, 'a native of Teliṅgānā, and a man of high position in his tribe'. His name was Kattu or Kannu. After he became a prisoner of war he earned his liberty by professing the Islāmic faith. After his conversion he was called Maqbul. By his devotion, service, and loyalty he won the favour of Sultān Muḥammad bin Tughlaq who bestowed upon him many favours, and perceiving 'in him many marks of sagacity, and intelligence' 'made him Deputy-Wazīr of Delhi'—E. D. III, pp. 367–68.

2. *Ante*, p. 11.

3. "కోలని ప్రతాపరుద్ర నృపకుంజరుచేత నరేడు సారణీ
సలిలవివర్ధమానబహుసస్యసమాకుల మగ్రహారమై
వెలయ విభాకరగ్రహణవేళఁ దగంగఁ బరిగ్రహించి బం
ధుల భరియించె నన్నవిభుతో సరియెట్లు ప్రధాను లెవ్వరున్."

Bhp. Canto. I, V. 49.

Kolani Pratāparudra's inscriptions prior to 1323 A.D., have not yet been discovered. Yet, there is evidence to show that he was a powerful commander under Kākati Pratāparudradēva. The *Sivayōgasāram*, a religious work in Telugu written by Kolani Gaṇapatidēva, a great-grandson of Immaḍi Rudradēva, brother of Kolani Rudradēva, furnishes interesting details about his ancestors while describing his lineage. The author's family was originally known as the Indulūri family. The progenitor of the family Nanna Gauraya had two sons, Peda Mallamantri and Pina Mallamantri who served under Rudradēva, son of Kākati Prōla II. Of these brothers the former had two sons, Sōma and Peda Ganna. Sōmamantri was the minister of Kākati Gaṇapatidēva. He is said to have ruled the country to the east of Warangal and conquered Southern Kaḷinga. It was during the rule of Gaṇapatidēva that he conquered the Telugu *maṇḍalikas* of Kolanuvīḍu[4] or Sarasīpura and as a consequence was known as Kolani Sōmamantri. Since that time, Kolani instead of Indulūri

---

Annamantri became a resident of Ārēḍu or Ariyēḍu after obtaining it as an *agrahāra* from Kolani Rudradēva. From thence his family came to be known as the Ariyēṭi family. After one of his descendants, another Annamantri became the governor of the Beṇḍapūḍi fort during the reign of Kumāragiri after its conquest by Kāṭaya Vēma the family came to be known as the Beṇḍapūḍi family.

4. Kolanuvīḍu was one of the renowned ancient fortresses of the Andhra country. It was first mentioned in the Aihole inscription of Pulakēśin II of the Cāḷukya family. It was then called Kunāḷa. The term Kunāḷa itself became, in all probability, first Kuḷāna according to metathesis, and subsequently Kuḷanu and Koḷanu in common parlance. Since Kolanu is the Telugu equivalent of the Sanskrit word Saras the city of Kolanu or Kolanuvīḍu was also known as Saraḥ-purī or Sarasīpurī. Pulakēśin II is said to have ravaged 'the water of Kunāḷa colored with the blood of men killed with many weapons, and the land

became the family name of his descendants. Kolani Rudradēva was the grandson of this Sōmamantri and a junior contemporary of Annayadēva, son of Peda Gannaya, brother of Sōmamantri.

Kolani Rudradēva[5] was the superintendent of the seventy two *durgas* in the kingdom of Pratāparudra of

---

with it overspread with arrays of accoutred elephants.' Obviously it was from the very beginning a *jala-durga.* Ever since Pulakēśin's conquest, Kunāḷa or Kolanu was under the rule of the Eastern Cāḷukyas of Vēṅgī. Materials are lacking to reconstruct the continuous history of the chiefs who ruled at Kolanu or Sarahpurī from the time of Pulakēśin II. We come to know that Nṛpākāma, son of Bāḷāditya was the lord of the Lake fortress (Saronāthaḥ or Sarahpatiḥ) during the rule of the Eastern Cāḷukyan prince, Bādapa. Next, we hear of Kolanu only in the time of the Cāḷukya-Cōḍa monarch, Vikrama Cōḍadēva, son of Kulōttuṅga Cōḍa I. It was then under one Bhīma, also known as Teluṅgu Bhīma who set up an independent rule defying the authority of Vikrama Cōḍadēva. Gonka's son, king Cōḍa *alias* Rājēndra Cōḍa of the Velanāṭi family led an expedition to Kolanu and killing Bhīma in battle, conquered it. It was since then under the rule of the Telugu Nāyakas. Okkettu Gaṇḍaya, otherwise known as Rājēndra Cōḍaya, the ruler of Kolanu is the first chief known to us from inscriptions. His inscriptions bearing dates Śaka 1047, and 1054 have come to light. His successor was Kolani Kāṭama Nāyaka or Kāṭaya, one of the commanders of Kulōttuṅga Cōḍa II. The dates in his records range from Śaka 1055 to 1073. Kāṭama Nāyaka was succeeded by Kolani Sāmi Nāyaka or Sōmayarāja. His records extend till Śaka 1117. His successor on the throne of Kolanu was Kēśavadēvarāja who had left many records behind him. He ruled for thirty-five years from Śaka 1118 to Śaka 1153. Kolani Maṅgayadēva (Śaka 1165) and Kolani Yeṟagayadēva (Śaka 1182) were the only two other chiefs known of this family. It was probably during the rule of Kolani Kēśavadēva that Indulūri Sōmamantri, one of the ministers of Gaṇapatidēva of Warangal conquered the impregnable fortress of Kolanuvīḍu and acquired the proud title of Kolani Sōma.

5. From the *Śivayōgasāram* we come to know that Kolani Rudradēva had the title, ' *Vyākaraṇa-brahma*—Brahma in respect of grammar. The line containing this title runs as follows :—

" నరులెల్ల వ్యాకరణ బ్రహ్మయన సక
లాగమవిదుఁ డయ్యెనట్టి యితఁడు."

Warangal, took part in the expedition to Kāñcīpura and defeated there in battle Vīra, Śēkhara (? Kula-śēkhara), Sundara (Jaṭāvarman Sundara), Vikrama and Vallabha Pāṇḍyas. He ruled over many *durgas* such as Cēbrōlu, Padminīpura, Dēvapura, Enamadala, Podili, Pōlacerla, Ādūru, Nūjeḷḷa, Sūravaram, Rājamahēndra-varam, Sāmalakōṭa, Piṭhāpuram, Bōḍasakuṟṟu, Beṇḍa-pūḍi etc.[6] The statement that he protected the stone

---

That Rudra got this title by having been the author of *Rāja Rudrīya,* a Sanskrit work on grammar is known from the interesting article " *Śivayōga-sāramu, Avatarаṇika* " which Pandit V. Prabhakara Sastri contributed to the Telugu journal, *Subhāṣi* (November, 1927). The work, *Rāja Rudrīya* is now preserved in the Government Oriental Mss. Library, Madras. The passages quoted below are found in the Colophons of this work :—

" इति राजरुद्रीये काशिकावृत्तिश्लोकव्याख्याने "
" आदिराज काकतीय प्रतापरुद्रप्रधानवर्यस्य
मुद्राक गन्नयसूनुरचितं वार्तिकव्याख्यानम् "—*Subhāṣi.*

6. Vide, verses quoted in the article entitled '*Annayadēvuḍu, Vinta-caritrāṁśamulu*' by the late C. Virabhadrarao, in *Subhāṣi*, October, 1927, pp. 33-35 ; and Kk. S., *Śivayōgasāramu* (appendix), pp. 15-16. The verse referring to the conquest of the Pāṇḍyas in the *Śivayōgasāram* as given in *Subhāṣi* and in Kk. S. is this :

" వీరకాకవసుంధర విక్రమేశ
బల్లహాలు నాఁదగిన పంచపాండ్యరాయ
మానమర్దనుండయ్యె బ్రహ్మణ్యరాజ
భద్రవిభవుండు గన్నయరుద్రవిభుఁడు "—*Subhāṣi.*

" వీర[మా]రవసుంధర విక్రమేశ etc "—Kk. S., p. 16.

The first line is faulty in both. I emend it as follows :—

" వీర, శేఖర, సుందర, విక్రమేశ etc.

Ballaha is a corrupt form of Vallabha. So the five Pāṇḍyas mentioned here are (1) Vīra Pāṇḍya, (2) [Kula]śēkhara Pāṇḍya, (3) Sundara Pāṇḍya, (4) Vikrama Pāṇḍya, and (5) Vallabha Pāṇḍya. As for the emended reading Śēkhara an explanation seems to be necessary. Va in 'Vasundhara' has to be deleted.

fort of Warangal so as to be commended by the Kākatēśa, and slew the *yavana* lords, clearly proves that he had taken an active part in the wars with the Mussalmans. That he survived the disaster that had overtaken Warangal is proved by his Santamāgulūr inscription,[7] dated in the cyclic year, Kṣaya, corresponding to 1326 A.D. which registers his gift for the merit of Kākati Pratāparudra.

Siṅgaya Nāyaka of the Rēcerla family also was a junior contemporary of Kākati Pratāparudra. He was the son of Ëṟa Dācā Nāyaka who was a descendant of Cevvi Reḍḍi, *alias* Bēti Reḍḍi, a native of Anumanagallu or Āmanagallu in the Nalgonda district of the Hyderabad state. Ëṟa Dācā Nāyaka's ancestors served under the Kākatīyas of Warangal. By their valorous deeds and loyal attachment to the throne they obtained many favours from their sovereign-lords and occupied high positions in the state. The princes of this Rēcerla family became great generals in the Kākatīya army, won distinction in many a battle, wielded considerable political power and influence in the state. Ëṟa Dāca, father of Siṅgaya Nāyaka accompanied Muppaḍi Nāyaka in his expedition to Kāñcī against the Pāṇḍyas; and his victory over them brought him the title, "*Pañca-Pāṇḍya-daḷa-vibhāḷa*". It is said tha the "constructed a *maṇḍala* with arrows and on the dais of the

It is Sundara and not 'Vasundhara'. Mā in 'Vīra [Mā]ra' is not clear. As such it was put in square brackets. Taking both the above readings into account I thought it might be 'Kākara' which might have been wrongly written for 'Śēkhara'. So it was emended as 'Śēkhara' which may be taken to stand for [Kula-] Śēkhara.

7. A. R. E. 1916, para. 53.

elephants, made an offering of the pride of the Pāṇḍya king in the *homa*-fire of his valour, and accepted the hand of the bride called Victory."[8] Eṟa Dāca Nāyaka's son, Siṅgaya Nāyaka also followed his father to Kāñcī and took an active part in the war with the Pāṇḍyas.[9]

Only these three generals of Kākati Pratāparudradēva are known to have survived him to see, as it were, the sad plight of the country. A new generation of leaders was yet in the making. The situation was such that the Hindu religion had to discover its champions from among the surviving old generals and the move for the liberation of the country had to come from the young nobles and chieftains. The people were groping in darkness, as it were, not knowing what to do in those times of horror and harassment. They were in search of a powerful leader who could gather around him all the discontented forces in the country and raise the standard of revolt.

Kolani Rudradēva grappled the situation, and gauged the depth of discontent prevailing in the land. Things reached at last such a state that only a bold stand and an intelligent lead was all that was required. He found that the country was ready to throw off the

---

8. H. A. R. 1933-34. Vide, appendix, Vāḍapalli inscription of the Rēcerla chiefs.

9. "లాలిత శౌర్యశక్తి నవలక్ష తెనుంగుదళంబు నాజిలోఁ
దోలిన పాండ్యభూవిభునితోడి పెనంకువ కోర్చి సన్నుతిన్
వాలి ప్రతాపరుద్రుసభ వర్ణన కెక్కిన యెఱ్ఱదాచ భూ
పాలసుతుండు సింగని కభంగుని కే బిరుదైనఁ జెల్లదే."—

VV. p. 13, v. 41.

foreign yoke. Rudradēva with his old colleague Annamantri, therefore, gathered together the descendants of the ancient *Mahāsāmanta*, and *Maṇḍalika* families, among whom particular mention may be made of Prōlaya Nāyaka of the Musunūri family, Prōlaya Nāyaka of the Koppula family, Vēma of the Reḍḍi family of Addaṅki, Siṅgama Nāyaka of the Rēcerla family and Gaṇapati Nāyaka of the Mañcikoṇḍa family. It was more or less a confederacy of nobles chiefly of the coastal region of the Andhra who, recognising the gravity of the situation, came together for the common purpose of rescuing the country from the Muslim domination and of protecting and upholding their *dharma*[10].

The language of the Vilasa, the Prōlavaram, and the Kaluvacēṟu grants clearly suggests that Prōlaya Nāyaka of the Musunūri family was elected as leader. It is apparent that Kolani Rudradēva and Annamantri, being old, did not aspire for leadership. Their only anxiety was to see the country rescued from the grip of the Mussalmans, and the Hindu *dharma* re-established. They probably found in Prōlaya Nāyaka a suitable leader in the circumstances then prevailing. When once the choice was made they co-operated with him in every possible way as commanders, advisers, and

---

10 The Kaluvacēṟu grant of Anitalli dated A.D. 1423 (A. S. P. P. II, P. 107) states that after the death of Pratāparudra, Prōlaya Nāyaka lifted up, like the Varāha incarnation of Viṣṇu, the earth which submerged under the waters of the ocean, *viz.*, the Mussalmans. His cousin and successor Kāpaya Nāyaka is referred to as the sovereign who had been served by seventy-two *nāyaks*. Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad evidently alludes to him when he speaks of a confederacy of nobles under Kanyā Pāyak who overthrew the authority of Muḥammad bin Tughlaq in Teliṅgānā at this time (*Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, Eng. Tr. I, P. 224.).

guides. The records of Vilasa, and Prōlavaram, no doubt, do not refer to Kolani Rudradēva; but having due regard to his antecedents and the position he occupied in the country at that time, it cannot be denied that he had a large share in choosing the new leader. Prōlaya Nāyaka was unknown to fame prior to 1323 A.D. He was not heard of before that date in any capacity either as a commander, *Mahāsāmanta*, *Maṇḍalika* or a minister of state under Kākati Pratāparudra. So he could not, by himself, have commanded the confidence of the people, had he not been set up by Kolani Rudradēva, who, as a powerful general, minister, as well as a near relation of Pratāparudradēva, wielded more influence and power than any one alive in the country at that time.

It is, however, inexplicable why the choice had fallen on Prōlaya Nāyaka in preference to Pratāparudra's relatives and descendants. There is a general opinion among scholars that all the members of the Kākatīya dynasty were either put to death or taken to Delhi as captives and that no one of that family was left alive in the country. As against this opinion it should be pointed out here that the present ruling family of Bastar in the Central Provinces traces its descent from one Annamadēva of the Kākatīya family who is said to be the brother of Kākati Pratāparudra.[11] An inscription [12] of the fifteenth century, from the Bellary district, of Viṭhṭhana Nāyaka says that his father Sōmaṇa Nāyaka

11. E. I., IX. p.165.

12. 434 of 1923. But it has to be pointed out that the Kākatīya monarchs never assumed the title 'Nāyaka'.

was born in the family of Pratāparudra, evidently the Kākatīya monarch of Warangal. These instances suggest that there were some members of the Kākatīya royal family who had escaped from the hands of the Muslim conquerors. Probably it was due to the flight of the relatives and descendants of Pratāparudra that Prōlaya Nāyaka had to be chosen as leader.

Prōlaya Nāyaka or Prōlānēḍu of the Musunūri family was a young and daring chieftain born in the *caturthakula* or the fourth caste. He was the grandson of Pōta and the son of Pōcā Nāyaka. He must have been a junior contemporary of the last Kākatīya monarch, Pratāparudradēva. Judging by his family name Prōla and his forefathers appear to have been originally the natives of Musunūru. As there are two villages of this name, one in the Nūzvīḍ taluk of the Kistna district, and the other in the Kāvali taluk of the Nellore district it is not possible to ascertain definitely their original habitat though in all probability they might have come from the latter. Some families having this house name are found even to-day both in the Kistna and Guntur districts among the people of the Kamma community, one of the many communities into which the *caturthakula* is divided. Prōlaya Nāyaka may, therefore, be said to be a member of the Kamma community. With the active co-operation and help of his relatives, and other *nāyaks* in the country and with the advice and guidance of veteran leaders like Kolani Rudradēva and Annamantri, Prōlaya Nāyaka set himself to work to free the country from foreign domination and re-establish the Hindu

supremacy. When the whole country to the south of the Vindhyas was in the grip of the Mussalmans, and had no hope of escaping from bondage, it was in the Telugu country that the movement for independence was at first started, and brought to a successful termination.

Section IV.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE HINDU REVIVAL.

The various attempts made, and schemes planned and executed to overthrow the Muslim government, are not known. A great majority of these confederates must have made the mountain fastnesses in the forest regions in the neighbourhood of the Gōdāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā their rendezvous so as to be out of the reach of the Muslim officers and yet be able to harass them incessantly with their predatory raids into the country both above and below the Ghats. People in general must have fully co-operated with them and afforded them, though secretly, all the help they could. It was indeed a momentous period in the history of the Andhra country. Without being led and guided by kings of either the solar or lunar dynasties the young nobles themselves made bold to fight for their religion and *dharma* and re-establish the Hindu supremacy. At last their attempts were rewarded with success which infused in the minds of the nobles as well as of the common people a new spirit and fresh hope and inspired them with indomitable courage to face the enemy in all their subsequent battles. The Vilasa and the Prōlavaram grants bear ample testimony to the new spirit that animated the Andhra people. The former states that Prōlaya Nāyaka freed the country of Tiliṅga from the Muslim domination.

"That king Prōla of the Musunūri family destroyed the oppresive supremacy of the *yavanas* by

the unrestrained strength of his arm which supported the *Viśva* or the world. Did his name become a *mantra* to exercise vile *yavanas* ('*uccāṭana-karma-kārī*')? Because, by hearing it merely repeated those despicable *yavanas* abandoned the forts and disappeared from every quarter. Just as the people afflicted by summer heat resort to the cool waters of a lake, those that were harassed by the *yavanas* took refuge under that powerful king, Prōla. The very people who were subjected formerly to constant harassment by the Turuṣkas, put them to death; verily, the strength accruing from *āśraya*—protection or shelter,—is of great consequence. In this way having overthrown the mighty *yāvana* world he, Prōlaya Nāyaka revived the *dharma* which was lost during the severe calamity."[1]

We have now to find out if Prōlaya Nāyaka freed the whole of the Telugu country from the Muslim yoke. The Telugu country comprises of three modern sub-divisions, namely, the Western Andhra country, Teliṅgānā, and the coastal districts. The Western Andhra or Rāyalasīma, as it is now called, comprises the districts of Cuddapah, Kurnool, Bellary and Anantapur. Teliṅgānā is the eastern half of the present Hyderabad state. The coastal Andhra country includes in it the districts of the East Godavari, the West Godavari, the Kistna, Guntur and Nellore districts.

1. Vide, Appendix, No. 1, ll. 42-48.

Contiguous with the East Godavari district Kaḷiṅga comprising the Ganjam and the Vizagapatam districts lies along the coast in the north.

Let us now take first the Western Andhra or the Rāyalasīma into consideration. This region was under the sway of the Kākatīya kings until 1323 A.D. The *kaifiyat* of Gaṇḍikōṭa refers to an inscription[2] of Gonkaya Reḍḍi, dated 1322 A.D. This clearly proves that the Kākatīya rule lasted over that region until almost the fall of Warangal. The whole of this country came under the sway of the Mussalmans after 1323 A.D. It remained under the Muslim rule until the revolt of the Āravīṭi chief, Sōmadēvarāja who overthrew, some years later, the authority of Delhi and conquered this region from the Mussalmans as will be shown later on. It cannot be said therefore that Prōlaya Nāyaka freed the Western Andhra country from foreign domination.

Teliṅgānā according to the Muslim Chronicles, was not reconquered by the Hindus at such an early date. It was in the hands of the Muslims until the reconquest of Warangal by the Hindus in 744 or 1344 A.D., according to Ferishta.[3] Even then the conquest was effected not by Prōlaya Nāyaka but by Kanyā Nāik of Barnī or Krishn Nāig of Ferishta. We have, therefore, to presume that it was only the coastal region of the Andhra country that was freed by Prōlaya Nāyaka.

The above conclusion is warranted by the provenance of inscriptions, in the coastal region, of the Hindu

2. L. R., Vol. XV, p. 55.

3. John Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. I, pp. 426-27.

chieftains and officers bearing dates subsequent to Śaka 1245 or 1323 A.D., as will be shown in a later context. The precise date of Prōlaya Nāyaka's conquest of the coastal region is not known to us. It is certain that it must have been accomplished later than the 10th September, 1324 A.D., the date of the Rājamahēndravaram mosque inscription of Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq.

The confederates were biding their time for a favourable opportunity to emerge from their mountain fastnesses and pounce upon the Muslim armies. Such an opportunity presented itself when Ghiās-ud-dīn Tughlaq died "in the month of Rabi'ul-awwal, 725 A.H.", (February—March, 1325 A.D.)[4] after his return from his expedition to Bengal. The crown prince, Ulugh Khān was busy in attending to the affairs nearer home and could not therefore have turned his attention to the South. The confederates did not loose this opportunity. Emboldened by the news of the death of the Sultan they sallied forth suddenly on the Muslim armies stationed in important centres, inflicted a series of defeats on them, reconquered the coastal region, and re-established the Hindu *dharma* and supremacy.

The very first inscription that testifies to these conquests is the Mallavaram stone record[5] of Vēmā Reḍḍi, son of Prōlaya Reḍḍi. The importance of this inscription cannot be over-estimated since it is the first Hindu record discovered in the coastal Telugu country subsequent to the fall of Warangal. This record describes Vēmā Reḍḍi as 'the very Agastya to the

4. *Ibid*, p. 408.

5. N. D. I., III, O. 73, pp. 1022-29.

ocean, namely, Mlēchchas'—(' *Mlēchch-ābdhi-Kumbhōd-bhavaḥ'*).[6] It registers some grant of land to the god, Rāghava by Vēmā Reḍḍi in the month of Āśvīja on the occasion of a solar eclipse in the Śaka year 1247[7]

---

6. This passage was restored. It occurs in the verse which begins with '*Dṛpt-ānantara-Rāja-bhūruha-mahā-srōto-vahā-nirjharō*' etc. The portion containing this verse (that is, ll. 41–45, and ll. 1–3 on the second side of the stone) is very much damaged. The published passages of this verse are very faulty. The same verse is found in the Madras Museum plates of Vēmā Reḍḍi (Vide, E. I., VIII, p. 14, V. 9). I give below the whole verse :—

" दृप्तानन्तरराजभूरुहमहास्रोतोवहानिर्झरो
मैत्रीसंगतराजकैरववनीसम्पूर्णचन्द्रोदयः
माद्यन्मन्नेनृपतूलपवनो म्लेच्छाब्धिकुम्भोद्भवः
श्रीमान् कोमटिवेमभूपतिरसौ वीरः कथं वर्ण्यते ॥ "

'*Dṛpt-ānantara*" was read, as '*Dṛpt-ānandhra*'; the first letter 'Mlē' in '*Mlēcchābdhi*' was read as *Malla*, and the last two letters '*dbhavaḥ*' of the same passage were read as [' *Ściraṁ*']—Vide, N. D. I. III, O. 73, p.1027.

7. According to Swami Kannu Pillai's *Ephemeris* there was a Solar eclipse on the 30th tithi or on the Amāvāsyā day of Aśvīja in 1325 A.D. Its English date-equivalent is October 7, 1325 A.D. The date of this inscription as given by Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty is Śaka 1227. Mr. H. K. Narasimhaswami who edits the Koḍūru grant of Anavōtā Reḍḍi in E. I. XXV., corrects it to Śaka, 1267. He gives his reasons for doing so in foot note No. 5 on page 139 which runs thus :

" The eclipse is said to have occurred at the end of (the month) Āśvina. It must therefore have been an eclipse of the Sun (*ahimāṁśu*, not *himāṁśu*, i.e., Moon, as understood by Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty—N. D. I., p. 1025) According to the *Indian Ephemeris* the details given in the inscription, Viz., ***Āśvinasy-āvasānē rāhu-grastē=himāṁśau Sura-guru-divasē*** i.e., the ending of Āśvina, Solar eclipse, Thursday, are regularly for the Śaka years 1267 (current)=A.D. 1344, October, 7, Thursday, on which day there was a Solar eclipse. In calculating the above date, the months have to be counted as amānta ones as it is the system adopted in South India. The word *vārddhi* in the chronogram *Śaila-vārddhi-dyumaṇi* as read by the authors mentioned above has therefore to be altered suitably by some such word as *tarka* to give the numeral 6 in place of 7, and the chronogram equated with 1267."

[represented by the chronogram *śaila* (7), *vārdhi* (4), and *dyumaṇi* (12)] which is equivalent to 1325 A. D.

The next dated Hindu record in the period under review is the Santa-Māgulūr inscription of Kolani Rudradēva. It is dated in the cyclic year, Kṣaya corresponding to Śaka 1248 or 1326 A. D., and registers a gift of land on the occasion of a Solar eclipse for the merit of Kākati Pratāparudradēva. Since there was only one Solar eclipse in the year, Kṣaya (in the month of Caitra on the 15th day of the dark fortnight or on Amāvāśya day) on the 3rd of April, the gift recorded therein must have been made on that day. This inscription refers to Kolani Rudradēva as the *Mahāpradhāni* of Kākati Pratāparudradēva, and attests to the devotion of the Hindus to that monarch who was already dead. It is likely that the confederates inspired confidence in the

The date, as understood by the editors of the inscriptions Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty, is certainly wrong. Mr. Narasimhaswami's contention that the eclipse in question was a Solar one ('*ahimāṁśau*' and not '*himāṁśau*') must be readily admitted. His date, Śaka 1267, however, cannot be accepted. The numerical values of *Śaila* and *Dyumaṇi* are doubtless 7 and 12 respectively. The value given to the term '*vārddhi*' by the editors mentioned above, and the correction made by Mr. Narasimhaswami are open to doubt. In epigraphical literature the synonymous terms *vārdhi*, *udadhi*, *abdhi*, *samudra*, *aṁbudhi*, *jaladhi*, and *jalarāsi* etc., represent invariably four and not seven (Vide, S. I. I., Nos. 1353, 1308, 1228, 1178, 1137, 702, 662 etc). Therefore, the Śaka year represented by the passage "*Śaila-vārddhi-Dyumaṇi-parimitē*" is Śaka 1247, and not 1277. In Śaka 1247 there was a Solar eclipse in the month of Āśvina or Āśvīja. Therefore, there is no necessity of replacing *vārdhi* by the word '*tarka*'. No doubt the week day does not tally. It is Monday and not '*Suraguru-divasa*' as stated in the grant. However, as the inscription was read very incorrectly in many places and is full of mistakes it is possible that the week-day also was read wrongly. Instead of '*Sura-guru-divasa*' it might be '*Himakara-divasa*' or '*Śaśi-dhara-divasa*'. The *chandas* also will not be affected by this emendation. Even if the reading of the editors of the inscription concerned is found to be correct what all we can say is that the date is irregular.

people by appealing to their sentiments in the name of Pratāparudra and reminding them of the happy days they had spent in his glorious reign. It might be that Pratāparudra's name was a magic touch to revive in the minds of the people loyalty and devotion to the cause taken up, and the religious fervour required to fight out the Muslim aggressors. Anyhow, the references to Kākati Pratāparudra of Warangal in the Vilasa and the Kaluvacēru grants enable us to know how much his name was cherished, and with what endearment he was remembered by the people. It is obvious, that at the time of making the grants recorded in the Mallavaram and the Santa-Māgulūr inscriptions alluded to above, the Hindus were masters of the tract of the sea-board, in which the above records were discovered, and that the early victories over the Mussalman armies were gained in the period between February–March and October of 1325 A.D. The date of the Mallavaram record marks the beginning of the victorious campaign of the Hindus, and the date of the Santa-Māgulūr record (April, 1326 A. D.) the completion of the conquest and the final liberation of the coast-region.

Happily this conclusion is further strengthened by numismatic evidence. The latest date on the coins of Sultan Ghiās-ud-Dīn Tughlaq, current in the coast-region of the Andhra country as has already been noticed above,[8] is 726 A.H., (1326 A.D.). Evidently during that year, 1326 A.D., some time about the spring season, the Hindus re-established their supremacy over the coast-region.

---

8. *Ante*, p. 17.

The Telugu poet Śrīnātha, in his work *Bhīmēśvarapurāṇa* states that Kolani Pratāparudra or Rudradēva made a grant of the village of Ārēḍu, in the Ellore taluk of the present West Godavari district, as an *agrahāra* to Annayamantri of the Beṇḍapūḍi family at the time of a solar eclipse.[9] This might be the same eclipse as that referred to in his Santa-Māgulūr record. This record and the *Bhīmēśvarapurāṇa* testify to the fact that it was under the guidance of Kolani Rudradēva that the movement for freedom was started, that he was responsible for making Prōlaya Nāyaka its leader, and that the village of Ārēḍu was granted to Annaya in appreciation of his services in the war. It is possible that the title, namely, "the establisher of the throne of the Superintendent of the Andhra Country"—("*Andhrabhū - maṇḍal - ādhyakṣa - siṁhāsana - saṁpratiṣṭhāpan-ācārya*")[10]—of Annamantri referred to in the *Bhīmēśvarapurāṇa* by Śrīnātha was obtained as a consequence of the very important and successful part played by him in the recent war of freedom. The phrase "*Andhra-bhū-maṇḍal-ādhyakṣa*" in the above title appears to refer not to Kākati Pratāparudradēva,

---

9. "కోలని ప్రతాపరుద్ర నృపకుంజరుచేత నరేడు. సారణీ
సలిల వివర్ధమాన బహుసస్యసమాకుల మగ్రహారమై
వెలయ విభాకరగ్రహణవేళఁ దగంగఁ బరిగ్రహించి బం
ధుల భరియించె నన్నవిభుతో సరియెట్లు ప్రధాను లెవ్వరున్."

—Bhp. Canto. I, V. 49.

10. Cf. the titles "*Kākita-rājya-sthāpanācārya*"—585 of 1909; "*Kākita-rājya-samuddharaṇa*"—586-1909: "*Kākita-rājya-sthāpan-ācārya*", and "*Kākita-rājya-pratiṣṭhāpan-ācārya*"—VV., and VVC.

but to the leader of the confederacy of nobles.[11] Anyhow, it cannot be denied that Annamantri of the Beṇḍapūḍi family and Rudradēva of the Kōlani family were the moving spirits of the period under review, and that they collaborated with others in re-establishing the Hindu supremacy and reviving the Hindu *dharma* in the coast-region of the Telugu country. Kolani Rudradēva's records subsequent to 1326 A.D., have not come to light so far. It is likely that he died soon after that date.

After the demise of Kolani Rudradēva, Prōlaya Nāyaka of the Musunūri family ruled the sea-board of the Andhra country as an independent monarch. It is probable that other chiefs and nobles, who had co-operated with him in liberating the country, ruled nominally as his vassals over their territories, which were either assigned to them by him or inherited from their forefathers. The Mallavaram inscription of Kōmaṭi Vēmāreḍḍi explicitly states that he was ruling the country around Addaṅki (in the Ongole taluk of the present Guntur dirtrict) independently. That it was his own principality, and that he was a

---

11. *Adhyakṣas* were officers of the state. They were Commanders, Superintendents and Governors and were never kings or monarchs. There were *hastyadhyakṣas*—commanders of the elephant forces, *rājādhyakṣas*—ministers(?) (S.I.I., VI, No. 132), *adhyakṣas* of villages and territorial divisions (*Peruval-adhyakṣa* Kūcimantrin, S.I.I., IV, No. 715; Ēruv-*adhyakṣa*, S.I.I., IV, No. 763), and superintendents ("*Boddaya-nāyakula-adhyakṣa* Nāgadēva, S.I.I., IV, 744). In the light of these facts I am inclined to take "*Andhra-bhūmaṇḍal-ādhyakṣa*" to mean the superintendent of the Andhra country, that is, the leader of the confederacy of nobles. If that passage really referred to Pratāparudra, the Kākatīya monarch, it would have been"*Kākati-rāja siṁhāsana-sampratiṣṭhāpan-ācārya*". There were generals who had such titles during the reign of Kākati Pratāparudradēva—Vide, foot note, 10 above.

subordinate of the Musunūri chiefs owing nominal allegiance to them, is known from the Kaluvacēru grant.[12]

Prōlaya Nāyaka's rebellion was the first of a series of revolts that broke out in the reign of Sultan Muḥammad bin Tughlaq. He was the first acknowledged ruler of the Andhra country after Pratāparudradēva. That the region between the rivers Gōdāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā was under his direct control is known to us from the Vilasa grant. He made Rēkapalli, in the vicinity of the Gōdāvarī, in the neighbourhood of the mountain Mālyavanta, his capital. Rēkapalli is identical with the village of the same name in the Bhadrāchalam taluk of the agency tract of the present East Godavari district. Mālyavanta may, therefore, be identified with the mountain range in the East Godavari district now known as the Eastern Ghats. It may not be far wrong to suppose that this region must have been the base of operations of the confederates, before and during their fight with the Mussalmans.

According to the Vilasa grant alluded to above, Prōlaya Nāyaka destroyed the *yavana* power by the irresistible strength of his arms. About the achievements of Prōlaya Nāyaka, the above grant states as follows:

> "King Prōlaya restored to the brahmans their *agrahāras* which were granted them by former kings but forcibly taken away from them by those wrong-doers (Turuṣkas). He revived the religious sacrifices

12. Vide Appendix No. II.

with their uninterrupted smoke emanating from oblations, and made pure the territories of the Andhras which were contaminated with sin as a result of their having been trodden by the Turuṣkas. The farmers gave him with pleasure that portion of the produce of their husbandry declared as due to the king by law, just as the ascetics gave one-sixth of the share of the fruits of their *tapas* or penance. Whatever was undone by the Pārasīkas on earth was restored to its former order by that mighty King."

Prōlaya Nāyaka had probably no issue. He placed the burden of the Kingdom on the shoulders of his cousins Kāpaya Nāyaka and others, even during his life-time and devoted himself to the pursuit of acquiring religious merit.

There is reason to believe that Prōlaya Nāyaka's reign was very short, though its duration cannot be precisely determined. A general of that eminence would naturally have thought of wresting the remainder of the Andhra country above the Ghats also from the clutches of the Mussalmans; but he did not live long enough to see his ambition realised. It was given to Prōlaya Nāyaka's cousin Kāpaya Nāyaka, to achieve that end. Prōla's death may be placed some time about 1340 A.D. The Vilasa grant is the only record of his reign that has as yet come to light. He was succeeded by his cousin, Kāpaya Nāyaka.

Kāpaya Nāyaka, of the Musunūri family, was the son of Dēvaya Nāyaka, brother of Prōlaya Nāyaka's father, Pōcaya Nāyaka. He was as energetic as he was

enthusiastic, and as daring, bold and powerful as Prōlaya Nāyaka. He learnt his first lessons in organisation, statesmanship and the art of warfare from his cousin Prōlaya Nāyaka, who had entrusted him with the task of liberating the present Teliṅgānā, the Andhra country lying to the west of the Eastern Ghats. Kāpaya Nāyaka's whole ambition was to regain Teliṅgānā from the Mussalmans, and re-hoist the Hindu flag of independence on the fort of Warangal. With this object in view, he set himself to enlist the active support of the neighbouring princes, raise the standard of a general revolt and concert measures necessary to free the country from the Muslim yoke.

Section V.

THE RE-CONQUEST OF WARANGAL.

The success attained by the Hindus of the coast-region appears to have encouraged revolts in the other portions of the Mussalman Empire. Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn Gurshāsp, the governor of Sāgar in the Deccan and, according to Al Badāūnī, the inspector-general of the Imperial forces, refused to acknowledge the authority of Muhammad bin Tughlaq, and to send him tribute. He made all preparations to meet any contingency that might arise. He won over to his side many nobles of his province, and after strengthening his forces attacked, towards the end of 727 A.H., (1326-27 A.D.) the neighbouring chiefs, who continued to owe allegiance to the new Sultān.

Gaining intelligence of this revolt, Muhammad bin Tughlaq sent Khwājā Jahān with the whole of the Gujarat forces to chastise the rebel. Bahā-ud-Dīn Gurshāsp met the invading forces at Deogir but was defeated. He then fled to Sāgar. Finding it unsafe to remain there, he fled from thence to the kingdom of Kampili, and took refuge with its ruler. To suppress this rebellion, Muhammad bin Tughlaq came from Delhi and took the field in person. After arriving at Deogir the Sultan sent the Imperial forces against Gurshāsp and Kampili. But they were twice defeated by the ruler of Kampili. The ultimate result, however, of this rebellion was the destruction of the kingdom of Kampili in 1327-28 A.D., and the capture of Bahā-ud-Dīn Gurshāsp who was later on flayed alive.

After the fall of Kampili, Muhammad bin Tughlaq stayed in that Kingdom for a period of two years and appointed, at the time of his departure to Delhi, a governor to rule over it.

During his absence from the Deccan, disorders again broke out. The state of the country after the Sultan's departure was well described by Nuniz, the Portugese chronicler, as follows:

> "The King having departed to his own kingdom...... leaving the kingdom of Bisnaga[1] in the power of Meliquy neby, when it was known throughout the country how he was out of it, those who had escaped to the mountains, with others who, against their will and through fear, had taken oaths of fealty for their towns and villages, rose against the captain Mileque neby, and came to besiege him in the fortress, allowing no provisions to go in to him, nor paying him the taxes that had been forced on them. And Meliquy neby, seeing how little profit he could get in this country, and how badly he was obeyed, and how far off was the succour sent by his lord the King, sent quickly to him to tell him how all the land was risen against him, and how every one was lord of what he pleased, and no one was on his side; and that his Highness should decide what he thought best to be done in such case."[2]

The leaders of this local rising were again the Andhras. It is not unlikely that Kāpaya Nāyaka had

1. Nuniz wrongly calls the kingdom of Kampili 'Bisnaga', that is, Vijayanagar. The kingdom of Vijayanagar was not founded by that time.

2. Robert Sewell's *Forgotten Empire*, Chronicle of Fernão Nuniz, p. 297.

some connection, either direct or indirect, with this rising also. The Telugu works, *Rāmarājīyam* of Andugula Venkanna and *Bāla Bhāgavatam* of Dōnēru Kōnērunātha, which furnish some interesting details regarding the family history of the Āravīṭi chiefs, throw some light also on the history of the period under review. These works state that the early Āravīṭi chief, Sōmadēvarāja, half-brother of Koṭikaṇṭi Rāghava and son of Tāta Pinnamarāja, fought with a Muslim ruler, Muhammad, took him captive after completely routing his army, but ultimately released him. Sōmadēvarāja is further credited with having conquered seven forts in a day, namely Ganginēnikoṇḍa, Kandanavol (Kurnool), Kaluvakolanu, Kōṭa Rācūru (Raichur), Mosalimaḍugu, Yātagiri, and Sātānikōṭa (Kurnool district). He won victories in the battles fought at Ākulapāḍu, Mudugallu (Mudgal), and Ānegondi etc.[3] Most of these places are in the vicinity of the Tuṅgabhadrā and the Kṛṣṇā, and some like Kōṭa Rācūru, Mudugallu (Mudgal), and Yātagiri (Yādgir) are situated in the doab country between the Kṛṣṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā. The Telugu works alluded to above do not assign any date to these conquests; yet, it can be easily determined if the contemporaneity of the Āravīṭi chief, Sōmadēvarāja, with the neighbouring princes is ascertained.

Sōmadēvarājā's half-brother, Kōṭikaṇṭi Rāghava, defeated, according to the *Bālabhāgavatam*, Kaṁpiladēva,[4]

3. The *Rāmarājīyam*, p. 23 (1923 edition, Vāviḷḷa Press); *Āravīṭivaṁśa-caritra*:—243 *dvipada* lines that describe the family history of the Āravīṭi chiefs were taken from the Telugu *Dvipada* work, *Bāla-Bhāgavatam*, and were separately published in the Telugu journal, *Bhārati* (1929 pp. 845–67) by Dr. N. Veṅkataramaṇayya with the above title. He adds valuable foot notes regarding the historical facts mentioned in the *dvipada* lines.

4. Vide, *Bhārati*, 1929, Vol. VI, No. 6.

the ruler of the Kingdom of Kaṁpili, comprising Hampi and Ānegondi, on the banks of the Tuṅgabhadrā, and the surrounding country. Kaṁpiladēva was a contemporary of the Hoysāla monarch, Ballāḷa III. Two inscriptions [5] dated 1320 A.D., and 1325 A.D., refer to the fights between Ballāḷadēva and Kaṁpiladēva. We thus come to know that Kaṁpiladēva was ruling Kaṁpili when Muhammad bin Tughlaq ascended the throne of Delhi in 1325 A.D. The rebellion of Bahā-ud-Dīn Gurshāsp broke out in the early years of the Sultan's reign, that is, in 1326-27 A.D. So it is clear that it was Kaṁpiladēva and his son Rāmanātha, who had given protection to Bahā-ud-Dīn Gurshāsp. Sōmadēvarāja, the half-brother of Kōṭikaṇṭi Rāghava, must have lived during the same period, that is, about the end of the first quarter of the fourteenth century. Sōmadēvarāja, as we know, won a battle at Ānegondi, evidently after the fall of Kaṁpili. Ānegondi was the early capital of the Vijayanagar rulers, Harihara I and Bukka I of the Saṅgama dynasty. Therefore, Sōmadēvarāja's activities have to be assigned to a date earlier than 1336 A.D., the date of the foundation of the kingdom of Vijayanagar, and later than 1327-28 A.D., the date of the fall of Kaṁpili. It is reasonable to connect this campaign of

---

5. E. C., VIII, Nr. 19, dated 1320 A.D.

Ibid, XII, Tp. 24, date 1325 A.D.

There is an undated inscription that refers to Vīra Kaṁpiladēva, son of Mummaḍi Siṅgeya Nāyaka on one of the pillars of the temple of God, Prasanna Virūpākṣa on the Hēmakūṭa hill on the southern side of the Virūpākṣa temple— Loc. Rec., Vol. XLVI, p. 424; Mack. Mss., No. 15-3-23. This has been copied in recent years by the Epigraphy Department, and is registered as 353 of 1934-5.

Sōmadēvarāja with the rising referred to by Nuniz. As is clear from the Telugu works mentioned above, the Āravīṭi chief, Sōmadēva, conquered not only the region of the Bellary and Kurnool districts but also a portion of the doab country between the Kṛṣṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā rivers. Some of the local chiefs also lent their support to, and co-operated with, Sōmadēvarāja. The Kōsagi chiefs claim to have destroyed the pride of Malik Nemal, who seems to be identical with Nuniz's Meliquy neby, the governor of Kaṁpili. The Muslim ruler, Muhammad, who is said to have been defeated by Sōmadēvarāja, might be a local military officer, a subordinate of Muhammad bin Tughlaq.

There is reason to believe that Kōmaṭi Vēmā Reḍḍi, son of Prōlaya Reḍḍi of the Addaṅki family, also co-operated with Sōmadēvarāja in re-conquering some of the forts from the Mussalmans. Vēmā Reḍḍi had the title "*Rācūrudurga-vibhāḷa*"[6] (the breaker of the fortress of Rācūru, *i.e.*, Raichur). Between 1294 A.D., the date of the construction of the fort of Raichur,[7] and 1336 A.D., the date of the foundation of the Vijayanagar Kingdom, Rācūru or Raichur was conquered only once, and that too by Sōmadēvarāja. Hence, the conquest of Rācūru, suggested by the title mentioned above, can refer only to this event. From this it is evident that Vēmā Reḍḍi and the other members of his family helped Sōmadēvarāja in rescuing the country from their common foe. Since Vēmā Reḍḍi was a subordinate[8] of the Musunūri chiefs,

---

6. S.I.I., VI, No. 243.

7. H.A.R., 1935–36 ; Vide Appendix E. pp. 32ff.

8. Vide Appendix No. II.

this campaign of Sōmadēva must have had the full support of Kāpaya Nāyaka, if not actually engineered by him.

After the departure of Muhammad bin Tughlaq from the Deccan, the Hoysāla monarch, Vīra Ballāḷadēva (III), also threw away his mask of subordination to the Sultan, and made common cause with the Hindus of the Andhra country. "At that time", says the *Vidyāraṇyavṛttānta*, "the Nava Ballāḷas, having gathered strength, rebelled against the Sultan in Karnāṭaka."[9]

Muhammad bin Tughlaq, having had intelligence of this revolt, sent one of the six persons who had been taken captive in the war against Kampili to rule over that province. On receiving the news the Sultan, according to Nuniz, "took counsel, telling the great people of the realm of the letter and the message which he had from Meliquy nebi, his captain and governor of the kingdom of Bisnaga."

"All the counsellors", continues Nuniz, "decided that the King should command the presence of the six men whom he held captive, and that he should learn from them who was at that time the nearest of kin, or in any way related to the Kings of Bisnaga; and, this questioning done, no one was found to whom by right

9. Vide Appendices in '*Kampili and Vijayanagara*' by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya.

The term 'Nava Ballāḷas' is enigmatic. It is likely that it represents the nine rulers of the Hoysāla (Ballāḷa) family. 'Ballāḷas' has to be taken as an honorific plural though only Ballāḷa III is meant here.

the Kingdom could come, save to one of the six whom he held captive, and this one he who, at the time of the destruction of Bisnaga, had been minister of the kingdom. He was not related by blood to the kings, but only was the principal judge; but (it seemed) good that His Highness should give the kingdom to that one. And this advice pleased the King and them all."

"At once the six captives were released and set at liberty, and many kindnesses and honours were done them, and the governor was raised to be King and the treasurer to be governor; and he took from them oaths and pledges of their fealty as vassals; and they were at once despatched and sent to their lands with a large following to defend them from any one who should desire to do them an injury."[10]

Rājakālanirṇaya and *Vīdyāraṇyakālajñāna*, besides corroborating what was stated above, state also that those who were sent were Harihara and Bukka. The former work states that, after they were released, Harihara and Bukka returned and took up their abode at Hastina Kōna, the Nagundy (Ānegondy) of Nuniz. They subsequently met Vidyātīrtha and became worshippers of God Virūpākṣa at Hampi.[11] The latter work states that the Sultan (Muhammad bin Tughlaq) sent an army against Ballāḷa under the command of Harihara and Bukka.[12]

---

10. Robert Sewell's *Forgotten Empire*, pp. 297-298.

11. S. V. Venkatēswara, *New light on the beginnings of Vijayanagara History*—Vide, *Founders of Vijayanagara* by S. Srikantayya, pp. 36-37.

12. Vide Appendices, *Kampili and Vijayanagara* by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya.

In a way the above account of Nuniz is confirmed by Zia Barni also. According to this contemporary historian he, who was sent by the Sultān to rule over the province of Kaṁpili as his subordinate, later on defied his authority and revolted at the time of the rebellion of the Hindus of Warnagal. "......A revolt broke out among the Hindus at Arangal. Kanyā Nāik had gathered strength in the country. Malik Makbul, the *naib-wazīr*, fled to Delhi, and the Hindus took possession of Arangal, which was thus entirely lost. About the same time, one of the relations of Kanyā Nāik, whom the Sultan had sent to Kambala (Kaṁpili), apostatised from Islām and stirred up a revolt. The land of Kambala also was thus lost, and fell into the hands of the Hindus."[13]

From Barni's history and the traditional accounts like *Rājakālanirṇaya*, *Vidyāraṇyakālajñāna* and *Vīdyāraṇyavṛttānta* it is evident that Harihara and his brothers were taken prisoners by the Sultan during the war against Kaṁpili and sent to Delhi, and that Harihara later on embraced Islām as a temporary expedient, and by his upright and obedient behaviour, won the favour and confidence of the Sultan who, subsequent to the revolt referred to by Nuniz, appointed him as the governor of Kaṁpili, being confident that a Muslim convert and native of the land, would bring the kingdom under his control. But contrary to the expectations of the Sultan, that governor, at the time of Kanyā Nāik's rebellion, apostatised from Islām and set up independent rule, after having won a victory over the Imperial forces.

---

13. E. D., III, pp. 245-246.

Incidentally we come to know of Kanyā Nāik, the leader of the rebellion of the Hindus of Warangal, whose name has not been heard before. Who is this Kanyā Nāik ?

It must be pointed out here that the leader of the rebellion referred to above is mentioned differently by different Muslim historians. Barni calls him Kanyā Nāik ;[14] Ferishta, Krishn Nāig ;[15] Nizām-ud-Dīn, Kanyā Pāik,[16] and Alī bin 'Azīz-Ullā, Kanābāyand[17]. Major J.S. King, the translator of the *Burhān ī-Mā'sir* points out that in different manuscript copies of that work the name is spelt variously as Kabānand, Kabānāyand, Kanānāyand, and Kananīdah.[18] This name in all its various forms may be split into two halves as shown here below :—

Krishn + Nāig	Kanā + Bāyand
Kanyā + Nāik	Kabā + Nand
Kanyā + Pāik	Kabā + Nāyand
Kanā + Nāyand	Kanā + Nīdah

The second part, Nāig, Nāyand, Nand and Nīdah, represents the corrupt transliteration of the words Nāyaka, Nāyanḍu, Nēḍu and Nīḍu ; it is a mere title suffixed to personal names, generally to denote a chief or noble, in the mediaeval period in the Telugu country. It does not require much imagination to recognise

14. Ibid, p. 245.

15. Brigg's *Ferishta*, I, p. 427.

16. *Tabaqāt-ī-Akbarī*, I, p. 224.

17. Major J. S. King's *Burhān-i-Mā'sir*, p. 9.

18. Ibid, foot notes, 15 and 17.

now that Kanyā Nāik of Barni, and Kanānāyand of 'Azīz Ullāh are the same, and that Kanyā Pāik of Nizām-ud-Dīn Ahmad and Kanābāyand of 'Azīz Ullāh are metathesal variants of Kāpya Nāik and Kabānāyand respectively, which are obviously corrupt forms of Kāpaya Nāik, and Kāpā Nāyanḍu. The above discussion enables us to understand that the leader of the Hindus of Warangal, Kanyā Nāik of Barni, is no other than Kāpaya Nāyaka. The other forms of this name are Kāpā Nāyanḍu, and Kāpā Nīdu. The forms Krishn Nāig, Kanyā Nāik, Kananāyand and Kanānidah are wrong. In fact, even one of the lithographic copies of *Tārīkh-i-Ferishta* gives the name of the leader of the rebellion as Kambā Nāik,[19] clearly a corruption of Kāpā Nāik.

The above conclusion is confirmed by epigraphical evidence. Since we come to know from the Prōlavaram grant[20] that Kāpaya Nāyaka was ruling from Warangal in 1346 A. D., it is certain that he was the king of Warangal or the Wali of Teliṅgānā at the time of the foundation of the Bahmani kingdom by 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Gangu Bahman Shāh in 1347 A. D. It was he who was alluded to in the different manuscripts of *Burhān-ī-Mā'sir* as Kabānāyand, Kabānand, Kanānāyand and Kanānīdah. The foregoing discussion makes it abundantly clear that it was Kāpaya Nāyaka of the Musunūri family who wrested Teliṅgānā from the hands of the Mussalmans some time prior to 1346 A. D.

It was no doubt due to the exertions of Kāpaya Nāyaka that Hoysāla Ballāḷa III joined the Hindus in

19. *Tārīkh-i-Ferishta*, text of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Persian and Arabic manuscripts, D. 57, Foot No. 136-B.

20. Vide Appendix No. III.

their revolt against Sultan, Muhammad bin Tughlaq. *Vidyāraṇyavṛttānta* and *Vidyāraṇyakālajñāna* state that, after crossing the river Kṛṣṇā, Harihara and Bukka, who were sent by the Sultan, encountered the enemies but were defeated[21]. It is thus elear that Harihara and Bukka were unsuccessful at first in subduing the rebels and bringing the kingdom under their control. It might be that at a later date some of the important forts of the kingdom, like Ānegondi and Kampili, were captured by them; for, they were in possession of those forts at the time of the rebellion of the Hindus at Warangal. Even then, all the country was not brought under their sway. Though they were natives of the land, they were unable to inspire confidence in, and win the goodwill of, the people, as the latter were very much prejudiced against them on account of their conversion to Islām.

Everywhere there was discontent in the land as a result of the oppressive rule of Muhammad bin Tughlaq.

The rigour and severity with which the taxes were collected is best described by Zia Barni in the following lines :—

> "The cesses were collected so rigorously that the raiyats were impoverished and reduced to beggary. Those who were rich and had property became rebels; the lands were ruined, and cultivation was entirely arrested."[22]

---

21. Vide Appendices, *Kampili and Vijayanagara.*

22. E. D. III, p. 238.

It is not known definitely if the measures regarding taxation were introduced in every part of the Sultan's dominions. Whether the assessment was enhanced or not, taxes were collected with as much rigour and severity, if not more, in other parts of his empire as in the northern doab region. The news of the policy, which the Sultan followed in the doab region, struck terror in the hearts of the people living in the other parts of his dominions. The effect produced by pursuing such a policy is described by Barni in the following passage :—

> " When the raiyats in distant countries heard of the distress and ruin of the raiyats in the Doab, through fear of the same evil befalling them, they threw off their allegiance and betook themselves to the jungles. The decline of cultivation, and the distress of the raiyats in the Doab, and the failure of convoys of corn from Hindustan, produced a fatal famine in Delhi and its environs, and throughout the Doab. Grain became dear. There was a deficiency of rain, so the famine became general. It continued for some years, and thousands upon thousands of people perished of want. Communities were reduced to distress, and families were broken up. The glory of the State, and the power of the government of Sultān Muhammad, from this time withered and decayed."[23]

When the country was in such a tense situation, a fresh rebellion broke out in the south. While the Sultan was busy in the north taking measures to relieve

---

23. Ibid.

the distress of the people from famine, and punishing the refractory nobles, Saiyid Jalāl-ud-Dīn Ahsan Shāh, who was appointed governor of Ma'bar, rebelled in the south in 1335 A.D.[24] He threw off his allegiance to the emperor of Delhi, and proclaimed himself independent. He was the first of the Sultans of Madura whose rule was later on brought to an end by the conquests of Kumāra Kampaṇṇoḍeyar, son of Bukkarāya, brother of Harihara I.

On receiving intelligence of this rebellion, Muhammad bin Tughlaq sent an army to subdue the rebels. But the army made common cause with the rebels and did not carry out the orders of the Sultan. Having come to know of the defection of his own army, the Sultan grew wild with rage and started for Ma'bar to put down the rebellion in person.

After reaching Daulatābād the Sultan laid heavy impositions afresh on that city and on the neighbouring provinces. "He made heavy demands", writes Barni, "upon the Mussalman chiefs and collectors of the Mahratta country, and his oppressive exactions drove many persons to kill themselves. Heavy *abwābs* also were imposed on the country, and persons were specially appointed to levy them".[25] Those who were not prompt in paying the new contributions were severely punished. Many people lost their lives on account of the difficulty of meeting them. People groaned under the heavy taxation.

---

24. J.R.A.S., 1909, pp. 667–83.

25. E. D., III, p. 243.

From Daulatābād the Sultan went to Warangal. During his stay there an epidemic, plague, broke out in his camp and carried away the high and low without distinction. Many officers and a great part of the army fell victims to it. The Sultan also was affected but escaped alive to Daulatābād by way of Bidar. He was in such a hurry to run away from Warangal that he had hardly time even to think either of the coast-region or of Kampili or of any other province.

The country of Telingānā was ablaze with sedition and unrest, owing to the imposition of the new taxes and the severity with which they were collected. In addition to these troubles there was famine and pestilence. The Sultan then realised the impossibility of controlling such a vast country like Telingānā in a state of rebellion, through the governor of Daulatābād. So, he made fresh arrangements for the effective administration of that country. Telingānā was divided into two parts, the eastern and the western, with Warangal and Bidar as their respective capitals. Malik Kabūl[26] was appointed

---

26. Ibid, pp. 243–44.

The name of the governor of Tilang or Eastern Telingānā is given differently by different historians. Zia Barnī calls him Malik Kabūl, and Ferishta, Mullik Naib Imad-ool-Moolk (Brigg's *Ferishta*, I, p. 423). Nizām-ud-dīn Aḥmad refers to him in one place as Malik Kabūl (*Tabaqāt-i-Akbari*, p. 222), and in another place Malik Maqbūl (Ibid, p. 224). Ishwari Prasad solves this riddle. He writes in his '*History of the Qaraunah Turks in India*' thus: 'Malik Maqbūl or Qabūl became *vazir-i-mamālik* under the distinguished title of 'Imād-al-Mulk' (p. 63). As such he calls him Malik Maqbūl (p. 145), and Malik 'Imād-al-Mulk' (p. 191). In the *Cambridge History of India* (Vol. III) Lt. Colonel Sir Wolseley Haig calls him Malik Qabūl.

It is likely that this governor, Malik Maqbūl was Kattu or Kannu of Shams-i-Ṣirāj 'Afif's account referred to above (See, p. 25, foot note, No. 1 above). If so, he was a native of Telingānā and originally a Hindu who became a prisoner of

governor of the eastern Telingānā, and Shihāb-i-Sultāni with the title of Nasrat Khān was placed in charge of Bidar with its dependencies, which yielded annually a revenue of ten million *tankas*.[27] Both these officers had to be under the direct control of the *wazīr* at Daulatābād.

The unstable condition of the southern provinces, which were entrusted to the *wazīr*, required a strong, upright and faithful officer at Daulatābād, with unflinching loyalty to the Sultan. In the reign of Ghias-ud-Dīn Tughlaq, Malik Burhān-ud-Dīn, father of Malik Qawām-ud-Din, who was the tutor of the Sultan, was in charge of the government of Deogir or Daulatābād.[28] The Sultan, probably apprehending that Burhān-ud-Dīn was too old and weak to control the situation, removed him from that office, and appointed in his stead his son Qawām-ud-Dīn, conferring on him the title of Qutlug Khān, " a man of great integrity."

After a stay of one month at Daulatābād, Muhammad bin Tughlaq returned to Delhi.

---

war during the Tughlaq invasion of Warangal. Shams-i-Ṣirāj 'Afif states that he was made, in course of time, deputy wazīr of Delhi. This appointment of Malik Maqbūl indicates the policy adopted by Muḥammad bin Tughlaq in appointing governors over the conquered territories. This shows that the governors were generally Muslim converts who were loyal unto the Sultan and were natives of the land over which they had to govern. Viewed in this light Harihara's appointment as the governor of the Kampili territory seems quite probable and was in accordance with the general policy adopted by the Sultan.

27. One crore of rupees according to Elliot's translation of Barnī. But, Ishwari Prasad says that Elliot has not correctly translated the passage (*A history of the Qaraunah Turks in India*, p. 146, see foot note 19 also).

28. The *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, Vol. I, p. 209.

The times were, thus, favourable to Kāpaya Nāyaka. He did not keep quiet. Secretly he was fanning discontent and fomenting trouble everywhere. Besides this he was very busy in securing the support of the neighbouring Hindu princes and in maturing his plans to raise openly the standard of revolt. His attempts in this direction and the results attained by him are described, though briefly, by Ferishta in the extract given below :—

"About this time (774 A.H. = 1343 – 44 A.D.) Kṛṣṇa Nāyak, son of Laddar Deo, who lived in the vicinity of Warangal, went to Belāl Deo, the powerful king of Carnatic, and told him that the Muhammadans had entered Telingānā and Carnatic, and had made up their minds to exterminate the Hindus. He suggested that something should be done to avert the crisis. Belāl Deo called a meeting of his ministers, and after a good deal of deliberation decided that, leaving his provinces in the rear, he should advance to the route of the army of Islām, and deliver Ma'bar, Dhorsamundar and Kambila from Muslim control and place them in charge of Kṛṣṇa Nāyak."

"In accordance with this plan Belāl Deo founded in the mountainous region near the frontier of his Kingdom, in a well-fortified place, a city which he named after his son Sajan Rāya. It was called Bijan Nagar, but by frequent use became Bijā Nagar. Numerous horse and foot were sent under Kṛṣṇa Nāyak, and Warangal was captured. The governor 'Imad-al-Mulk fled to Daulatābād. Belāl

Deo and Kṛṣṇa Nāyak both combined their forces and delivered Ma'bar and Dhorsamundar, which had been, for years in the past, tributaries of the ruler of Carnatic, from Muslim control."[29]

In the passage quoted above Kṛṣṇa Nāik (Kāpā Nāik) is said to be a son of Laddar Deo or Pratāparudra of Warangal. In the light of the available evidence, this statement of Ferishta cannot be accepted as true. In the

---

29. This passage is from Ishwari Prasad's *History of the Qaraunah Turks in India'*, pages, 201–02. He says that this is a translation of the passage in the Lucknow text of Ferishta. Brigg's version, as he remarks, is somewhat different. I am also appending below a translation of the same passage in the text of *Tārīkh-i-Ferishta*, of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Persian and Arabic manuscripts. (Ms. No. 135, f. No. 108 B.) My thanks are due to Dr. N. Venkataramanayya for translating the passage.

"At this time (744 A. H.) Kambā Nāik, son of Ladder Dēv, who was in the neighbourhood of Warangal went privately to Balāl Dēv who was the great king of Carnatic and told him that the Mussalmans, having entered the kingdoms of Tiling and Carnatic desire to extirpate them at one stroke, that the matter deserved serious consideration, and that he should take action upon it. Then Balāl Dēv, having summoned to his presence all the nobles of his kingdom, asked their advice. After deliberation it was decided that Balāl Dēv should leave the whole of his kingdom behind him and make the frontier in the path of the armies of Islām his residence, and should take from the possession of the Mussalmans Ma'bar, Dhorsamand and Kaṁpila. In this year which was suitable, Kambā Nāik should take possession (of Teliṅgānā) from the Court of Delhi and occupy Warangal also.

"Balāl Dēv built in an inaccessible place among the hills on the frontier in the name of his son, Sujan rāy a city which became famous as Bījannagar and in course of time, owing to constant usage, it became Bījānagar. He sent a large body of cavalry and infantry with Kambā Nāik, and the latter took possession of the throne of Warangal. The Wazīr Imād-ul-Mulk having fled (from the place) arrived at Delhi.

"Afterwards Balāl Dēv and Kambā Nāik having given assistance from both the sides to the kings of Dhorasamand and Ma'bar, who had been tributaries from ancient times to the king of Carnatic, wrested also those countries from the clutch of the Mussalmans."

first place the appellation 'Nāyaka' or 'Nāik' is not suffixed to the names of the Kākatīya rulers. It was usually attached to the names of nobles and subordinate chiefs, dependent upon the Kākatīya monarchs, *e.g.*, Mācaya Nāyaka, Jāyapa Nāyaka, Muppiḍi Nāyaka, Siṅgama Nāyaka etc. Zia Barni, who calls the leader of the rebellion of the Hindus of Teliṅgānā Kanyā Nāik, does not tell us that he was a son of Pratāparudra. No other Muslim chronicler alludes to the relationship between the rebel leader and Pratāparudra. Epigraphical evidence does not confirm Ferishta's contention.

It must, however, be pointed out here that it was customary among the subordinates of the Kākatīya and Hoysāla monarchs to style themselves as the sons of their sovereigns; for example, Juṭṭayaleṅka Goṇkaya Reḍḍi called himself son of Pratāparudra.[30] If Kāpaya Nāyaka was at least a junior contemporary of Pratāparudra and served under him in some capacity or other, he might, in the same way, be regarded as the son of that monarch, if Ferishta's statement is sought to be justified.

It is evident from the passage quoted above that Kāpaya Nāyaka, after having secured the co-operation of the neighbouring Hindu monarchs and local chiefs, raised the standard of revolt, and with the allied forces attacked Malik Maqbūl, the nāib *wazīr* of Teliṅgānā. Unable to withstand the attack of the Hindus Maqbūl fled from Warangal. Teliṅgānā once again came into the possession of the Hindus. Kāpaya Nāyaka re-hoisted the flag of Hindu independence on the fort of

30. Loc. Rec., Vol. XIII, p. 39, Ep. Coll. 239 of 1905.

Warangal and became the ruler of the Andhra country. After this victory he assumed the proud titles of '*Andhra Suratrāṇa*', the Sultan of the Andhra country, and '*Andhradēśādhīśvara*', lord of the Andhra country.

The news of the rebellion in Tilang reached the Sultan while he was busy in bringing into subjection the Hindu rebels in Hindustan who had withheld the payment of tribute. He was so busy with his affairs there that he was unable to turn his attention to the south.

When the Hindus of Teliṅgānā rose in rebellion, there was revolt at Kampili also. "About the same time," writes Zia Barni, "one of the relations of Kanyā Nāik, whom the Sultan had sent to Kambala, apostatised from Islām and stirred up a revolt. The land of Kambala (Kampili) also was thus lost, and fell into the hands of the Hindus." [31] Ferishta writes thus: "One of the relations of the Rājā Kand whom Sultan Muhammad had made Mussalman, and whom he had sent to Kambila, apostatised from Islām and rose in rebellion. Kambila also was wrested from the lieutenants of the Sultan. On every side sedition, which was latent, became manifest, and among the distant countries nothing remained in the possession of the emperor of Delhi with the exception of Gujarat and Deogir."[32]

Harihara, the governor of Kampili, gained the favour of the sage, Vidyāraṇya, the pontiff of the Vīrūpākṣa

---

31. E. D. III, pp. 245-246.

32. From the text of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, kindly translated for me by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya.

temple at Hampi on the banks of the Tuṅgabhadra, became his protege, and apostatised from Islām. Through that guru's influence and favour, he was able to secure the co-operation of the local chiefs and Hindu leaders of the Western Andhra country and of the region around Kampili, and threw his whole weight on the side of the Hindus. Like Kāpaya Nāyaka he also succeeded in wresting the country of Kampili from the hands of the Mussalmans and in establishing his independence. Īṣāmy, a contemporary of Muhammad bin Tughlaq like Zia Barni, writes thus in his *Futūh-us-Salāṭīn*: "Tilang having rebelled, the fort of Tilang (Warangal) passed away from the hands of the Turks. An apostate (from Islām) conquered the country of Kannaḍ, from Gūty as far as the boundary of Ma'bar."[33]

The Kāpalūru[34] and the Bāgēpalli[35] grants are the earliest records attributed to Harihara. According to these grants the date of the foundation of the kingdom of Vijayanagar is Śaka 1258, corresponding to the cyclic year Dhāta. Harihara's next record[36] is dated in Śaka 1259 corresponding to Īśvara. It states that Hariharamahādēvarāya and his *sarvapradhāni* (premier) Bukkaṇa Oḍeyar granted to brahmans *karaṇīkas* (*i.e.* office of karaṇam or accountant) with lands attached to it in the presence of God Paṁpā-Virūpākṣēśvara.

33. I quote from the article on '*The date of the rebellions of Tilang and Kampili against Sultan Muḥammad bin Tughlaq*' by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya in I.C., Vol. V, p. 264.

34. N. D. I. I, C. P. No. 15.

35. E. C. X, Bg., 70.

36. Loc. Rec., Vol. XXXVII, p. 291.

His next inscriptions, dated in Śaka 1261, corresponding to the cyclic year Pramāthi, come from Bādāmi [37], and Aṭakalaguṇḍu. [38] The latter states that Harihara was ruling from the *nelavīḍu* at Gooty (Anantapur district).

What is the date of Kāpaya Nāyaka's rebellion? No Muslim chronicler assigns any date to this rebellion except Ferishta. His date is 744 A.H., or 1343-44 A.D. This date is untenable in the light of the dates of Harihara's records referred to above, since Kāpaya Nāyaka's rebellion preceded that of Harihara I at Kampili. Harihara was already an independent and powerful ruler wielding considerable authority over the neighbouring princes of the country by the time of Ibn Batūta's visit to Honavar on the west coast of India in 1342 A.D., for, he says that the Sultan of that place was 'subject to the supremacy of an infidel king, named Hariab',[39] who is of course Harihara I of Vijayanagar. The Bādāmi stone record alluded to above, which records the grant of the villages of Bādāvi (Bādāmi) and Muṇḍanūr "as a *sarvamānya* grant" to the glorious two thousand of Bādāvi in the presence of God Bhūtanātha by Mahānāyakācārya Cāmeya Nāyaka, gives Harihara, his sovereign lord, all his titles generally found in his later records, and styles him as "*Śrīman Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara arirāya ... bhāṣegetappuvarāyaragaṇḍa pūrvapaścima-samudrādhīśvara Śrī Vīra Hariyappa Voḍeyar*". It

37. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. X, p. 63 ff.

38. Mack. Mss., No. 15-4-27.

39. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri—*Foreign Notices of South India*—Ibn Batūta, p. 234.

further states that Cāmeya Nāyaka constructed the fort and eastern parapet of Bādāmi, probably at the command of his sovereign. This inscription clearly proves that Harihara was ruling his kingdom independently in 1339 A.D., the date of that record, and that his sway extended as far as Bādāmi in the north, far beyond the river Tuṅgabhadra. The Aṭakalaguṇḍu inscription referred to above also suggests that Harihara was an independent ruler. As Harihara's Kāpalūr and Bāgēpalli copper-plate records are declared spurious by some scholars, they are left out of account here. The re-conquest of Warangal by Kāpaya Nāyaka must have therefore taken place before the date of the Bādāmi and Aṭakalaguṇḍu records of Harihara I, and after the date of the Ma'bar rebellion which preceded the rebellion of the Hindus in Teliṅgānā. When did the rebellion in Ma'bar break out? Ibn Batūta states that Jalāl-ud-Dīn Ahsan Shāh "rebelled, usurped the power, killed the lieutenants and agents of the sovereign, and struck coins of gold and silver in his own name."[40] The latest date found on the coins of Muhammad bin Tughlaq in the Madura region is 734 A.H.,[41] (1333—34 A.D.), and the date of the earliest coin struck at Madura in the name of Jalāl-ud Dīn Ahsan Shāh is 735 A.H.,[42] (1334—35 A.D.). So, the rebellion in Ma'bar broke out some time at the end of the year 1334 A.D. With a view to put down this rebellion, Muhammad bin Tughlaq started for Ma'bar and reached Warangal some time in the year 1335 A.D., but, due to an epidemic, his stay

40. Ibid, p. 217.

41. J.R.A.S., 1922, p. 344.

42. Ibid.

there was very short, and he returned hurriedly to Daulatābād in the same year. Ibn Batūta says that after his return to that place "the provinces rose, anarchy reigned in the country."[43] It may, therefore, be concluded that Kāpaya Nāyaka's rebellion broke out between 1335 A. D., and 1339 A. D., most probably in 1336—37 A. D., or Śaka 1258—59.

---

43. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri—*Foreign Notices of South India*—Ibn Batūta, p. 219.

Section VI.

THE REIGN OF KĀPAYA NĀYAKA.

After his victory over the Mussalmāns, Kāpaya Nāyaka made a triumphant entry into Warangal. He assumed the titles '*Andhradēśādhīśvāra*' (lord of the Andhra country), and *Andhra Suratrāṇa* (Sultan of the Andhra country), and ruled Teliṅgānā and the coast-region as well, with Warangal as his capital. After assuming the reins of the kingdom, Kāpayà Nāyaka strengthened his position by conferring chiefships and other offices upon his relatives and members of his caste, who had stood by him loyally and co-operated with him whole-heartedly during the war of independence. He even concluded marriage alliances with some of them.

Kāpaya Nāyaka appointed his cousin Anavōta, son of Rāja Nāyaka, as the governor of the coastal Andhra country. Anavōta had his capital first at Toyyēṟu[1] in the Cōḍavaram taluk of the East Godavari Agency district and later on at Rājamahēndravaram[2] on the banks of the Gōdāvarī. He is generally called Toyyēṭi Anavōta because of his residence in Toyyēṟu for

1. Vide, Appendix, No. 3.
"पुत्रोपिराजनृपते रनवोतभूप
स्तोय्येटिनामनगरीपति रार्यबन्धुः"

2. "...........వేఁగి దేశంబులో
నేపారు రాజమహేంద్రపురికి
నధిపతి తొయ్యేటి యనవోతభూపాలు......" —VS.R. Canto I, v. 33.

a long time. Muppabhūpa, son of Teluṅgunṛpa of the Gurajāla family and the patron of the Telugu poet Maḍiki Siṅgana, ruled the Sabbināṭi-rājya,[3] corresponding to the present Karimnagar district and its adjacent territory lying on the southern bank of the Gōdāvarī, in the Hyderabad State. His capital was Rāmagiri[4] in the Adilabad district in the same State. His family-name indicates that these chiefs or their forefathers were originally natives of Gurajāla in the Palnād taluk, Guntur district. One Teluṅgunṛpa is referred to in an inscription[5], dated Śaka 1257 at Tripurāntakam in the Mārkāpur taluk of the Kurnool district, who might be identical with the father of Muppa or Muppiḍi. Another loyal supporter of Kāpaya Nāyaka was Kūnaya Nāyaka of the Mañcikoṇḍa family[6] who, according to the Local

---

3. It is the same Sabbi one thousand province mentioned in the Anumakoṇḍa inscription of Prōla II of the Kākatīya family which is said to have been ruled by his father, Kākati Bētarasa by the favour of the Western Cāḷukya king, Vikramāditya VI (E.I., IX, p. 256).

Also refer to the note by Mr. G. H. Khore in the *Indian Culture* (July, 1941, p. 113), on 'the Daulatābād Plates of the Western Cāḷukya King, Jagadēkamalla of Kalyāṇa.

4. "గౌతమీదక్షిణంబునం బరమపావనంబగు సబ్బినాఁటిరాష్ట్రంబున రామగిరిపట్టణంబు నిజరాజధానిగా...... ముప్పభూపాలచంద్రునకు......"

—PP. Introduction.

5. Ep. Coll. 261 of 1905.

6. An interesting account of the family name Mañcikoṇḍa is given in the Śrīrangam plates of Mummaḍi Nāyaka (E.I., XV, pp. 83 ff). It is said that, in times of yore, a king named Mukkaṇṭi brought Mañci and Koṇḍa, two leaders of a Nāyaka family to the Teliṅga Country, and that they built there after their names a city which subsequently became the gotra of their descendants. Compare the Rēceṟla-gōtra of the princes of Rājukoṇḍa and Dēvarakoṇḍa. There is a village called Rēceṟla in Teliṅgāṇā of the Hyderabad State.

Records, built the fort of Kōrukoṇḍa[7] eleven miles north-north-east of Rājamahēndravaram in the East Gōdāvari district. It is probable that the fort was built at the instance of Kāpaya Nāyaka for the purpose of guarding against inroads of the forest tribal chiefs of the mountainous tracts into the plains, and to render military assistance in times of need to his representative in the coast-region. Kōrukoṇḍa subsequently became one of the principal strongholds on the eastern bank of the Gōdāvarī. Kūnavaram, a village at the confluence of the Gōdāvarī and its tributary the Śabarī, in the Bhadrāchalam taluk of the East Godavari district, might have been named after Kūnaya Nāyaka. If this surmise is correct the village may serve to indicate the extent of the territory under his jurisdiction. Kāpaya concluded a marriage alliance with Kūnaya Nāyaka's family by giving his sister's daughter in marriage to the latter's son, Mummaḍi Nāyaka. Kōmaṭi Vēmāreḍḍi[8] another subordinate of Kāpaya Nāyaka, ruled the territory to the south of the Kṛṣṇā with Addaṅki in the Ongole taluk, Guntur district, as his capital.

Kāpaya Nāyaka made necessary administrative arrangements to ensure law and order in the country. Having been apprehensive of an invasion from Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlaq, who generally did not tolerate the slightest deviation from the path of obedience, much less a revolt in any quarter of his dominion, he

---

7. *Kaifiyat of Kōrukoṇḍa*, published by Mr. R. V. Rāyajagapativarma, Peddapuram.

8. Vide, Appendix No. 2.

fortified old forts, occupied strategic positions in Telingānā and increased his forces.

While he was busy attending to these defensive measures Kāpaya Nāyaka confronted trouble from the Rēcer̤la princes. From the time of Gaṇapatidēva of the Kākatīya dynasty, these princes of the Rēcer̤la family were in charge of the country around Anumanagallu or Āmanagallu and Pillalamar̤r̤i, their native towns in the Sūryapēt taluka of the Nalgoṇḍa district in the Hyderabad State. Of these princes Siṅgama Nāyaka I, son of Yer̤a Dācā Nāyaka, a powerful chief attacked Kāpaya Nāyaka. The reasons that led to this conflict between these two cheifs, are nowhere recorded. Siṅgama Nāyaka, who had served under Kākatī Pratāparudra in the last years of his rule, must have co-operated for the time being with Kāpaya and other nobles of the Telugu country in the war of independence in A.D. 1336-37. Now, he did not probably like Kāpaya Nāyaka—in his view an upstart—to assume supreme control and sovereignty over the whole of the Andhra country. So he did not even formally acknowledge his authority like other nobles in the country. Sometime after the conquest of Waraṅgal, Siṅgama Nāyaka appears to have moved to Rājukoṇḍa[9] or

9. The *Velugōṭivāri Vaṁśāvaḷi*, the primary authority for the history of the Rēcer̤la chiefs, does not allude at all to Rājukoṇḍa until the time of Anavōtā Nāyaka. According to that work Anavōta Nāyaka and Māḍā Nāyaka, after their return from the victorious campaign, ruled Anumanagallu (Vide, VV., p. 21), and they divided between themselves the cities of Rājukoṇḍa and Dēvarakoṇḍa; the former taking Rājukoṇḍa, and the latter, Dēvarakoṇḍa (*ibid*, p. 37). From this it is evident that Rājukoṇḍa was already in the possession of the Rēcer̤la princes even before the time of Anavōta. *Rasārṇavasudhākaram*, a

Rājācala in the Nalgoṇḍa district, sixty miles to the west of Anumanagallu and Pillalamaṟṟi, a place more secure than either of these two villages because of its position among mountains, and built a fort there which subsequently became the capital of the Rēceṟla family.

While Kāpaya Nāyaka was busy with his defensive arrangements, Siṅgama Nāyaka was active in extending his power beyond Rājukoṇḍa to its north and south. In the struggle for power, both Siṅgama Nāyaka and Kāpaya Nāyaka stood face to face against each other and in the fight that ensued, Kāpaya Nāyaka was defeated[10] and driven away.

Kāpaya Nāyaka does not appear, however, to have suffered any material loss on account of this defeat. He asserted his power soon and spread his authority as far as Pillalamaṟṟi, the native town of the Rēceṟla chiefs, if not further south, as is proved by his Pillalamaṟṟi inscription[11] dated Śaka 1279 or 1357 A.D. This inscription dubs Kāpaya Nāyaka with the title *Anumanagaṇṭipuravarādhīśvara*, lord of the city of Anumanagallu,

---

work on rhetoric, which was written by Anavōtā Nāyaka's son, Siṅgama Nāyaka II, states that Rājācala or Rājukoṇḍa was the hereditary capital of the Rēceṟla family. These references indicate that it came into the possession of the Rēceṟla princes probably in the time of Siṅgaya Nāyaka I who must have built a fort there and that it became the primary capital of the Rēceṟla princes only from the time of Anavōtā Nāyaka. The statement made by the *Velugōṭivārivaṁśacaritra* that Siṅgama Nāyaka, son of Era Dācā Nāyaka was living in Rājukoṇḍa and Dēvarakoṇḍa in the time of Kākatī Pratāparudra lacks confirmation.

10. "జెలఁగి మీ ముత్తాత సింగక్షితీశుండు
కాపభూపతి గెల్చెఁ గదనమునను" —VV. p. 43, v. 20.

11. I.T.D.N.D., No. 40, pp. 113 ff.

which was originally borne by the Rēcerla princes. The same title is found in Kāpaya Nāyaka's Gaṇapēśvaram inscription[12] also, dated Śaka 1268 or 1346 A.D. The assumption of this title by Kāpaya Nāyaka indicates his victory over the Rēcerla chief Siṅgama Nāyaka about A.D. 1346, the date of the Gaṇapēśvaram record. In those days it was the custom for the vanquisher to assume the titles of the vanquished with their insignia, as an indication of his supremacy over him. Titles like these, borne by nobles and kings of those days, help us to know some of the historical events and their dates, which cannot otherwise be known from any other source.

Peace and order were again restored in the country and Kāpaya Nāyaka was now free to proceed with his work of reconstruction.

About this time political events in the Deccan were taking an unexpected turn. The *Amīrān-i-ṣadah* or the centurions, as they are generally called, rose in rebellion. In 1347 A.D. (A.H., 748) Daulatābād fell into their hands. They elected Ismāīl Makh Afghān under the title Nāṣir-ud-Dīn as their king.

On hearing the news of this revolt Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlaq, who was then in Broach, hastened to Daulatābād. In the vicinity of that city the rebels waited to give him battle. A fierce engagement ensued between the insurgent forces and the Imperial armies. The

12. S.I.I. Vol. IV, No. 950.

rebels were defeated and Ismāil Makh with some of his army retired to the fort of Daulatābād to defend it, while Hasan, another prominent leader of the centurions, proceeded towards Gulbarga to harass the Imperialists there. The Sultan sent Imād-ul-Mulk Sartez with an army to pursue Hasan, and himself proceeded to Daulatābād and laid siege to the fort.

In the course of this siege, news reached the Sultan that the *Amīrān-i-ṣadah* in Gujarāt, joined by the zamīndārs of that country, stirred up a rebellion under the leadership of Malik Tughan, who had not only captured the capital, but was besieging Broach also. On hearing the news the Sultan, having left one of his generals to conduct the siege of Daulatābād, proceeded with a large contingent of his army to Gujarāt.

Encouraged by the absence of the Sultan from the Deccan, the rebels who took refuge in Daulatābad, fought with the besiegers with re-doubled strength and vigour, baffling all their attempts to reduce it. Their numbers also gradually swelled, which enabled Ismāil Makh Afghān to send five thousand horse in aid of Hasan, conferring on him the title of Jaffar Khān[13].

---

13. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 288. But Muhammad Hādi states that this title was conferred on Hasan by Muhammad bin Tughlaq himself. After narrating the same story as that given by Ferishta regarding the admission of Hasan among the leaders of the Hundred, Hādi writes "...The Sultan took him into his favour. Gradually his rank increased to such a degree, that he was appointed, above all the Mughal mercenaries, governor of Kulbarga and its vicinity....... Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq, being a very cruel prince, put the *amīrs* of Sind, Dakhin, and Gujarāt to death. But the Almighty God saved Hasan from destruction. The Sultan, having invested him with the title of Zafar Khān, and conferred on him Bhakkar which was one of the dependencies

The political situation in the Deccan demanded the full attention of Kāpaya Nāyaka. He thought it would be wise to throw in his lot with the centurions whose victory would obviate the chances of an attack any more on Warangal by Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlaq, and to make common cause with those who might become his neighbours. Swayed by such considerations as these, he readily despatched a contingent of fifteen hundred infantry in aid of Hasan.[14]

With the reinforcements received both from Ismāil Makh and Kāpaya Nāyaka, Hasan who had been so far eluding any engagement with Imād-ul-Mulk Sartez, openly gave him battle and attacked his army. In the affray the Imperialist general Imād-ul-Mulk was slain and his army was put to rout. Hasan then marched with his troops to Daulatābād. At his approach the besiegers, who had already learnt about the death of Imād-ul-Mulk, lost all courage and hopes of success, and raising the siege, took to flight.

Hasan entered Daulatābād in triumph. Ismāil Makḥ then found out that the officers and the army were showing more regard and attention to Hasan than to himself. He, therefore, prudently resigned his office in his favour. Hasan who was elected king with the unanimous consent of the people and the army,

---

of Bhakhrī, in Jāgīr, went to Gujarāt, and thence turned his course towards Thatta, where the army of death attacked him, and sent him to the world of non-entity."—E.D., Vol. VIII, pp. 15-16.

14. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 289.

ascended the throne in A. H. 748 (1347 A. D.),[15] and assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh Bahmanī. He became the founder of the Bahmanī dynasty, which held sway over the Deccan for nearly one and three quarters of a century.

The successful revolt of the *Amīrān-ī-ṣadah*, which resulted in the foundation of the Bahmanī Kingdom in the Deccan, subsequently proved a source of trouble and danger to the Hindu kingdom of Warangal, instead of ensuring its security and integrity as had been originally expected by Kāpaya Nāyaka. 'Alā-ud-Dīn, after his elevation to the throne, resolved to subdue every part of the Deccan, which was previously subject to the throne of Delhi, and extend his sway. With this object he sent one of his officers, named Sikandar Khān, to conquer Teliṅgānā. The Bahmanī general invaded the dominions of Kāpaya Nāyaka, little remembering the valuable help he had rendered to 'Alā-ud-Dīn at a time when it was needed most.

Kāpaya Nāyaka, king of Warangal, was taken unawares. He was apprehensive of an attack only from the Sultan of Delhi. He little expected an invasion of his territory by 'Alā-ud-Dīn whose ally he was and with whom he had been, till that moment, maintaining friendly relations. The result of this aggression can be very well conjectured. Kāpaya Nāyaka was defeated and forced to sign a treaty.

Ferishta and 'Azīz-Ullāh describe this campaign of 'Alā-ud-Dīn differently in somewhat different

---

15. J.B.O.R.S., Vol. XXVII., p. 468, and Table II, opposite to p. 466.

tones in their works, though the result, according to both, is the same—the defeat of Kāpaya Nāyaka. Ferishta states that 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh wrested Kaulas (in the present Nizāmabād district in the Hyderabad State) with its dependencies from the Rājā of Warangal and formed a treaty of alliance[16] with him; whereas 'Azīz-Ullāh tries to depict Sikandar Khān and 'Alā-ud-Dīn as having been considerate to, and on friendly terms with, Kāpaya Nāyaka who is represented to have tendered his submission to 'Alā-ud-Dīn merely on receipt of a letter from the Muslim general.

> "Sikandar Khān", says 'Azīz-Ullāh, "after his return (from Bīdar and Mālkhēd) sent a letter to Kanābāyand who was the wālī of Teliṅgānā, asking him to send a present of some elephants for the use of his army. When Sikandar Khān's letter reached Kanābāyand and he understood its contents, he wrote a reply, tendering his submission, and sending a written treaty to that effect: he also expressed a great wish to meet him. Accordingly Sikandar Khān with a large force proceeded towards Teliṅgānā, and a meeting between the two took place. Kanābāyand presented many valuable offerings, and was made hopeful of much favour from the king. He sent two elephants and other suitable presents to the king through Sikandar Khān. The latter on arrival at [?] sent the elephants to the Sultan and informed him of the goodwill of Kanābāyand. The Sultan wrote a commendatory letter

16. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 293.

to Sikandar Khān and exalted him to the umbrella: he also conferred royal favours on Kanābāyand."[17]

'Azīz-Ullāh never makes any mention of Kaulas, much less of taking it by force by 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh. A comparison of the statements of both Ferishta and 'Aziz-Ullāh, leads us to understand the bare truth that, in reality, Sikandar Khān invaded the kingdom of Warangal and, inflicting a defeat on Kāpaya Nāyaka, forced him to conclude a treaty by ceding to 'Alā-ud-Dīn the fortress of Kaulas with its dependencies, besides offering some "elephants and other suitable presents." This event must have taken place between 1347 A. D. and 1351 A.D., since Ferishta alludes to it before the death of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlaq in the latter year.

Even after this treaty Kāpaya Nāyaka's sovereign status remained the same as before the invasion. This is evident from the Muslim chronicles. Forced by circumstances Kāpaya concluded a treaty with Sikandar Khān as an independent ruler and never agreed to acknowledge the supremacy of 'Alā-ud-Dīn. According to the terms of the treaty there was no stipulation that he should pay an annual tribute to the Bahmanī Sultan. Ferishta and 'Azīz-Ullāh do not allude to this. Probably this was the consideration shown by the Sultan to Kāpaya Nāyaka for the help he had rendered to him at a critical moment.

After the death of Muhammad bin Tughlaq 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh, having been relieved of the constant

17. Major J. S. King—*History of the Bahmanī Dynasty*, I.A., Vol. XXVIII, pp. 145–146.

fear of an attack from Delhi, was left free to proceed undaunted with the task of conquering the neighbouring kingdoms and extend his authority.

Kāpaya Nāyaka was not allowed to remain in peace even after the cession of the fort of Kaulas, because he had not yet acknowledged the supremacy of 'Alā-ud-Dīn and become in reality his loyal subordinate. So, 'Alā-ud-Dīn, after a lapse of some years, led another invasion against Teliṅgānā with a view to reduce permanently Kāpaya Nāyaka to submission.

Ferishta alludes to this invasion, in his history, very briefly in a few sentences in the same way as he did to the first. "The Rājāh of Tulingana" says he, "who had thrown off all fealty, was treated with generous forbearance, on account of the assistance he had rendered to the king; and he now voluntarily agreed to pay the tribute he had here-to-fore remitted to the king of Delhi".[18] This short passage makes it clear that, till the time of the second invasion, Kāpaya Nāyaka was not paying any tribute to 'Alā-ud-Dīn. The Bahmanī Sultan now determined to exact it annually from Kāpaya Nāyaka, and hence this invasion. In order to justify this act of aggression Ferishta puts forth the plea that Kāpaya Nāyaka threw off all fealty. 'Azīz-Ullāh does not, in his account, refer to this plea at all. He simply says that 'Alā-ud-Dīn, being desirous of conquering Teliṅgānā, led another invasion.

" After spending some time in pleasure in his capital, he was again desirous of conquering the country of

18. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 294.

Tilang (Teliṅgānā) and acquiring a name and reputation; so orders were issued to the army to move in that direction. According to orders the army assembled and marched towards Teliṅgānā. The Sultan sent on in advance a number of his officers with scouts to devastate the country of the infidels whilst he followed in rear of them. For nearly a year he travelled through the country of Teliṅgānā, and having taken possession of the district of Bhonāgīr he overthrew the idol-temples, and instead of them, built mosques and public schools. When he had completed the conquest of Teliṅgānā he returned to his capital, and opening the doors of justice and kindness in the face of his subjects and soldiers, acted generously towards all the inhabitants of the Dakhan."[19]

The date of this second invasion of Teliṅgānā is not given anywhere. But it is possible to ascertain it roughly. The Pillalamaṟṟi inscription[20] of Kāpaya Nāyaka, dated June 2nd, 1357 A. D., alludes to this invasion. It records that Kāpayā Nāyaka's subordinate, named Eṟapōtu governor of Pillalamaṟṟi, re-consecrated the idol of god Eṟakēśvaradēva, which was desecrated and broken by Sultan 'Alā-ud-Dīn during the invasion, for the merit of his sovereign Kāpaya Nāyaka, and of his parents Anumakoṇḍa Mācaya Nāyaka and Rudrasāni. This consecration ceremony must have been done at least some four or five months after the

19. Major J.S. King—*History of the Bahmanī Dynasty*, I.A., Vol. XXVIII, p. 152.

20. I.T.D.N.D., No. 40, pp. 113ff.

restoration of peace in the country subsequent to the invasion. 'Azīz-Ullāh states that 'Alā-ud-Dīn was in Teliṅgānā for nearly a year.[21] So it may be concluded that 'Alā-ud-Dīn started on this campaign about the end of the year 1355 A. D., and was in Teliṅgānā during the year 1356 A. D.

That this campaign of 'Alā-ud-Dīn was a very extensive one and that he overran the Telugu country as far even as the coast, is known from references to this invasion in the records of the Reḍḍi kings of Koṇḍavīḍu. The invasion of the *yavanas* from the west, alluded to in the Amarāvati inscription[22] of Anavōta, son of Prōlaya Vēma, the founder of the Reḍḍi kingdom of Koṇḍavīḍu, might be the same as the second invasion of 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh into Teliṅgānā. During this incursion god Amarēśvaradēva in Dhānyavāṭī (Dhānyakaṭaka or Amarāvati) also was desecrated by the Muslims, as was done at Pillalamaṟṟi, and the Amarāvati inscription of Anavōta was set up to record the re-consecration ceremony of that god by his minister, Kētaya Vēma who is said to have defeated the *yavanas* (Mussalmāns). There is yet another record of the Reḍḍi Kings, the Pedapūḍi grant[23] of Kōmaṭi Reḍḍi, son of Māca Reḍḍi,

---

21. *History of the Bahmanī Dynasty*, I.A., Vol. XXVIII, p. 152.

22. S.I.I., Vol. VI, No. 226.

23. *Mack. Mss.*, No. 15-4-42.

"वेमाधिपस्यावरजोपिमल्ल
भूवल्लभोसौ जगदेकमल्लः
अल्लावदीनादितुरुष्कमल्लान्
समुल्लसद्धंग(?)गणान् विजिग्ये ॥"

dated Śaka 1326 or 1404 A. D., which directly refers to 'Alā-ud-Dīn. It explicitly states that Mallā Reḍḍi, brother of Prōlaya Vēmā Reḍḍi defeated 'Alā-ud-Dīn in battle. These two records conclusively prove that 'Alā-ud-Dīn invaded the country as far as the coastal-region and was defeated and driven back by the Reḍḍi kings of Koṇḍavīḍu.

'Alā-ud-Dīn's invasions into Teliṅgānā indirectly affected Kāpaya Nāyak's authority over the coastal Andhra country. His hold over the chieftains in the coastal-region became much weakened ever since the defeat he had sustained for the first time at the hands of 'Alā-ud-Dīn. Kāpaya Nāyaka was unable to move from Warangal or to turn his attention to the affairs of the coast since he was confronted with the menace of the growing power of the Bahmanī Kingdom in his neighbourhood, ever ready to annex Warangal. The semblance of authority which Kāpaya Nāyaka was exercising over the coastal-region vanished gradually subsequent to 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan's invasion of Teliṅgānā. The latest record [24] of Kāpaya Nāyaka, found in the coastal-region is dated in Vyaya, corresponding to Śaka 1268, and in the next year, that is Sarvajit (Śaka 12 [69*]) an inscription [25] at Dakshāram registers the gift of offerings to God Bhīmēśvara by his cousin, Anavōtā Nāyaka, son of Rāja Nāyaka.

'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh died on Rubi-ul-awwal 1,760 A. H., (January 31, 1359 A. D.)[26] He was succeeded by his son, Muhammad Shāh I.

---

24. S.I.I., IV, No. 950. 25. *Ibid*, No. 1294.

26. J.B.O.R.S., Vol. XXVII, p. 468; Table opp. p. 466.

After the death of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Kāpaya Nāyaka carried on negotiations to overthrow the power of the Bahmanī Sultans, with the king of Vijayanagar with whom he had been maintaining friendly relations ever since the conquest of Warangal. Both Kāpaya Nāyaka and the kings of Vijayanagar realised the danger to their political interests of the existence of a growing Muslim state in their neighbourhood. Like Kāpaya Nāyaka Harihara I, the king of Vijayanagar, also was deprived of some of his territory[27] to the north of the rivers Tuṅgabhadra and Kṛṣṇā. The need to protect and maintain their common interests and the Hindu supremacy in the Deccan brought them together and strengthened the bonds of their friendship. Henceforward they began to plan and work together for the overthrow of the Bahmanī kingdom. But fortunately for that state, Muhammad Shāh, a very powerful ruler, occupied the throne of Gulbarga at this juncture.

Soon after the accession of Muhammad Shāh I the Rājas of Teliṅgānā and Vijayanagar are said, according to Ferishta, to have instigated the Hindu bankers of the Deccan to melt "all the (Bahmanī) coins which fell into their hands, in order that those of the infidels might alone be current in the Deccan", and sent messengers to his court to demand restitution of the territories wrested from them by his father," "threatening, in case

27. Harihara I lost his territory to the north of the river Kṛṣṇā. Many of the forts in the doab country between the Kṛṣṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā including Bādāmi, were conquered by the Bahmanī Sultans. Ever since the beginning of the Bahmanī power the country between the doab became a bone of contention between the Vijayanagar and the Bahmanī kingdoms.

of refusal, not only to invade his country themselves but to draw upon him the army of the king of Delhi."[28]

Muhammad Shāh I sent his ambassadors to their courts and detained their messengers in his court for over a year and a half to gain time in order to complete all necessary arrangements both for defensive and offensive purposes. He then demanded from them their best elephants laden with jewels without fulfilling their demands.

Much enraged at this, Kāpaya Nāyaka sent his son, Vināyak Dēv with a large army to capture the fort of Kaulas. In his aid Bukka I, king of Vijayanagar, sent a considerable force, amounting to 20,000 horse. [29]

Muhammad Shāh sent a large army under Bahadūr Khān to oppose Vināyak Dēv while he himself started to meet the Vijayanagar forces.[30] The armies of Islām

---

28. Brigg's *Fershta*, Vol. II, p. 301.

29. Lt. Colonel Sir Wolsely Haig says that the Vijayanagar ruler, Bukka I supplied a contingent of 20,000 horse for the enterprise (Vide, *The Cambridge History of India*, Vol. III, Ch. XV, p. 379). As we know, this took place in the beginning of 763 A.H. (1361 A.D.) (Vide, Appendix No. 4).

30. The only Muslim Historian who describes in detail the campaigns of Muhammad Shāh, son of ' Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh, is Ferishta. The accounts of Nizām-ud-Dīn Ahmad and 'Aziz-Ullāh are very brief. There are differences in the accounts of these Muslim historians regarding the chronological order of the campaigns. Neither of them describe all the campaigns. Ferishta's account, though a detailed one, is full of confusion. He combines some of the campaigns into a single one. Unless a systematic study is made of these accounts it is not possible to know either the order of the campaigns or their dates. The results of a systematic and scientific study of the accounts of the campaigns of Muhammad Shah I is embodied in the paper entitled " the order and chronology of the campaigns of the Bahmanī Sultan, Muhammed Shah I ", and appended as Appendix, No. 4 in this work. The order followed in regard to the different campaigns of Muhammad Shah, and the dates assigned to them in the above text, are based on it.

ultimately came out victorious in the engagements. After plundering the Vijayanagar country Muhammad Shāh returned to his capital, Gulbarga, with a rich booty in jewels, Arab horses, and elephants. Vināyak Dēv appears to have been successful in the beginning of his campaign; for, Bhonāgīr which was included in the kingdom of 'Alā-ud-Dīn came again under the rule of Kāpaya Nāyaka. The Muslim Chronicles do not include this fortress in the dominions of Muhammad Shāh. Ultimately inflicting a severe defeat on Vināyak Dēv who was compelled to take refuge in his fief Velamputtan[31], Bahadūr Khān proceeded as far as the gates of Warangal and forced Kāpaya Nāyaka to sue for peace by offering large sums of money, twenty-five elephants and many valuable jewels[32].

Kāpaya Nāyaka, even after this event, was not allowed to rest in peace for a long time. His son, Vināyak Dēv's reported behaviour provoked the wrath of Muhammad Shāh who again took the field to chastise him. It is alleged that Vināyak Dēv had forcibly taken the best of the horses reserved for Muhammad Shāh from a caravan of horse-dealers who were on their way to Gulbarga in spite of their vehement protests. After

31. This is unidentifiable. Nizām-ud-Dīn Ahmad calls this Bilampatan and 'Aziz-Ullāh Ṭabāṭabā, Fīlampatam. It was no doubt on the trade route to Gulbarga which passed through the Andhra country. From this it is clear that the seaport in which the Arab horses landed, and from which the horse-trade was carried on with the Eastern Deccan was in the Telugu country. Since Muhammad Shāh proceeded to Velumputtun by way of Kalyāṇ and Kaulas (in the Nizāmabād district, Hyderabad State) it must have been in Northern Telingānā, somewhere on the southern bank of the Gōdāvarī.

32. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 301.

their arrival at the capital in 763 A.H.,[33] (1362 A.D.) the horse-dealers made this allegation against Vināyak Dēv in reply to the complaint of Muhammad Shāh that the best horses suitable for his stables were not brought by them. On hearing the horse-dealers' reply Muhammad Shāh felt his dignity was wounded. He regarded this act of Vināyak Dēv as an affront to his honour and to avenge this he led an expedition against Velamputtun, the fief of Vināyak Dēv.

With a light contingent of four thousand cavalry Muhammad Shāh reached Velamputtan by rapid marches and taking the people unawares, entered the city and massacred the Hindus. On receiving the alarm, Vināyak Dēv, who little expected this invasion, fled with great haste and difficulty to the citadel, which was soon besieged by the Sultan.

During the course of the siege Vināyak Dēv, however, was taken prisoner while trying to escape, and was demanded an explanation for what he had done. The insolent replies, said to have been given by Vināyak Dēv, made Muhammad Shāh so relentless, inconsiderate and inhuman that he gave orders to cut off his tongue

33. Vide, Appendix No. 4. (At the end of 763 A.H.).

In fact, the Lucknow text of Ferishta (p. 285) furnishes this date for the arrival of the horse-dealers at the capital of Gulbarga. The following is the translation of the beginning of the passage concerned.

"Finally in the year seven hundied and sixty three 763 (A.H.) at the time when Sultan Muhammad Shāh sitting in his chair was performing ablutions, it was brought to his notice that a company of merchants came bringing with them some horses etc."

8 2I am much indebted to Dr. N. Venkataramanayya for translating this passage.

and hurl him from a manjnik set up on the ramparts into the fire kindled below. Muhammad Shāh plundered the city, levied heavy contributions on the people, and after staying there for some time, started on his return march with the treasures of Vināyak Dēv.

Much exasperated by the cruel and atrocious deeds of the Sultan the Telugu people gathered in numbers to take revenge upon him. Hiding themselves during day time and coming out of their recesses during night, they harassed the Sultan so much that he was compelled to order his men to burn the baggage together with the plunder, excepting jewels and gold, in order to effect rapid marches and escape from their attacks. The harassment by the Telugus was so great that by the time the Sultan reached Kaulas, only about one third of his army was left alive and even the king himself received a wound in his arm[34]. Because of the arrival of reinforcements at Kaulas the rest of the Sultan's journey was accomplished peacefully.

On hearing the news of the death of his son, Vināyak Dēv, Kāpaya Nāyaka was plunged in sorrow. His only thought now was to devise means to overthrow or subdue the Bahmanī Kingdom. It had already grown strong, and was a source of constant menace to his own kingdom, Warangal. With all the armies at his command, and with the help and co-operation he received from the kings of Vijayanagar, Kāpaya Nāyaka was unable, according to the Muslim historians, to inflict any defeat on the Bahmanī armies, much less to protect the integrity of his own kingdom. He, therefore, in his

---

34. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 304.

despair, thought of appealing to a superior power, the Empire of Delhi, to achieve his object. At that time Fīrūz Shāh, the successor of Muḥammad bin Tughlaq, was the emperor of Delhi. The efforts made in this direction and the results attained by Kāpaya Nāyaka, are well described by Ferishta in the following lines:

"In the year seven hundred and sixty-four 764 the Rāy of Tiling who was plunged in sorrow at the death of his son formerly and the devastation of his country, sent petitions to the court of Malik Fīrūz Shāh Bārbak, the emperor of Delhi."

"News reporters of Sultan Muhammad Shāh sent him letters from Delhi that, at this time, the petition of the Rāy of Tiling arrived before the throne resembling the throne of God. Its purport was that the slave (Rāy of Tiling) was on the straight of obedience and unshaken fidelity. If the order of the auspicious seal was issued to the nobles of Mālwā and Gujarāt that they should march demanding the restoration of the Deccan, that humble servant also together with the Rāy of Bījānagar, putting on the belt of service and sacrifice, would not fail in devotion and good services. Within a short time wresting that land from the possession of the rebels of Daulatābād he would have the honor of kissing the feet of the slaves of the court with the tribute of all these years."

"As it was known that the invasions of the Deccan and the conquest of these parts were not auspicious to the emperors of Delhi, Malik Fīrūz Shāh Bārbak, paying no heed to send a reply to the petition, neglected it."

"And Sultan Muhammad Shāh, coming out with the intention of subduing Tiling, issued an order to his (maternal) uncle's son, Khān Muhammad that he should collect the army of Daulatābād and encamp in the ghats above Daulatābād near the tank of Qutlagh Khān. In safeguarding that frontier he should not make any allowance for deficiency. He sent orders to Safdar Khān Sīstāny and A'azam Humāyūn summoning them to the court; and when they with their armies equipped, arrived at Hasanābād-Gulbarga they reviewed their troops. Sultan Muhammad Shāh, having entrusted the ancient capital to the care of Malik Saif-ud-Dīn, unfurled the standards of conquest. Having arrived by uninterrupted marches at Kaulas, he dispatched A'azam Humāyūn with the armies of Ahmadābād-Bīdar and Māhur and its environs towards Gōlkoṇḍa; and appointing Safdar Khān Sīstāny with the army of Bērar to march against Warangal, he followed him in the rear accompanied by Bahadūr Khān at leisure. And in the meantime, the Rāy of Bījānagar having died, his brother's son ascended the throne in his place. The Rāy of Tiling, being deprived of help from that side, lost hope; and unable to oppose in any manner the Muslim army he fled to the jungles and hills." [35]

Muhammad Shāh remained in Teliṅgānā for a period of two years, during which he ravaged and laid waste the country.

---

35. *Tārikh i-Ferishta*, Lucknow Text, p. 286.

Having no other means to save his country from still further destruction and devastation Kāpaya Nāyaka sued for peace; but the peace proposals were rejected by the Sultan who was determined to crush his power entirely. However, at the intercession of Bahadūr Khān a treaty was at last concluded in 1364–65 A. D.,[36] between Muhammad Shāh I and Kāpaya Nāyaka, by which the latter offered three hundred elephants and two hundred and fifty horses besides paying a war indemnity of thirty-three lakhs of rupees and ceding in perpetuity the hill fort of Gōlkoṇḍa. On the same occasion Muhammad Shāh, at the request of Kāpaya Nāyaka, fixed Gōlkoṇḍa as the boundary between his kingdom and the kingdom of Warangal, and conjured "his successors, as long as the Rājas of Teliṅgānā refrained from breaking their faith, not to molest them."[37]

After the conclusion of this treaty, Kāpaya Nāyaka presented to Muhammad Shāh a throne studded with turquoises and consequently called Takht-i-Firūzī (or the turquoise throne) which had been originally prepared as an offering to Muhammad bin Tughlaq, the emperor of Delhi.

Muhammad Shāh was true to his word after this treaty, and never after invaded Teliṅgānā during his reign. Subsequent to this treaty, the relations between the Bahmanīs and the Musunūri Nāyaks were cordial.

---

36. Vide, Appendix No. 4.

37. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 306.

While Kāpaya Nāyaka was engaged in war with the Bahmanīs the Rēcerla princes sufficiently built up their power to defy his authority. In the beginning of Muhammad Shāh's reign Siṅgama Nāyaka extended his kingdom as far as the banks of the Kṛṣṇā. Ēlēśvaram[38] on the northern bank of that river, and some of the forts in the doab region that lay between the Kṛṣṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā, fell into his hands. In the course of his campaigns Siṅgama Nāyaka came into conflict with the Cāḷukya princes of the lunar race who had established their authority long before over the Doab region. These kṣatriyas of the Cāḷukya family were probably the descendants and relatives of the Āravīṭi chiefs who were appointed as governors of forts in the doab country subsequent to Sōmadēva's conquest of Maliquy Neby, governor of Kampili. Siṅgama Nāyaka proceeded with a huge army and laid siege to the fort of Jallipalli,[39] one of the strongholds of the Cāḷukya race, in order to liberate his brother-in-law, Cintapalli Siṅgama Nāyaka[40] who was imprisoned in that fort. It is likely he

---

38. Siṅgabhūpāla's *Rasārṇavasudhākaram*—Introductory portion—Verse —" *Kṛṣṇ-ailēśvara-sannidhau......*etc."

39. The Village Jallipalli (now called jalpalli) is in the Chintakunta taluk, Mahaboobnagar district, Hyderabad State.

40. Cintapalli Siṅgama Nāyaka, the brother-in-law of Rēcerla Siṅgama Nāyaka, was the fifth in descent from the Paisāla chief, Pōtuganṭi Maili or Mailānēḍu, whose valorous deeds are recorded in many a *cāṭu* verse. His father Vallabha, and his grandfather Khanḍiyarāya Aubhalēndra *alias* Abba Nṛpa are said to have been lords of Cintapallipura in the *cāṭu* verses. But in the Telugu work describing the *birudāvaḷi* (collection of titles) of the seventy-two Nāyakas that served under Kākatī Pratāparudra these Nāyaks of the Paisāla family have the general title, *Vellaṭūripuravarādhīśvara* (lords of the town of Vellaṭūru). From these it is clear that they were originally the natives of the Guntur district since the two villages, Cintapalli and Vellaṭūru are in the same district.

was captured by the Cāḷukya princes while waging war against them on behalf of his brother-in-law, Rēceṟla Siṅgama Nāyaka.

Rēceṟla Siṅgama Nāyaka delivered a vigorous attack on the fort of Jallipalli. The Cāḷukya chiefs lost

---

The pedigree of these Nāyaks of the Paisāla family given below, is based on the *cāṭu* verses quoted in the *Cāṭupadya Maṇimañjari*, Part II, compiled by Pandit Śrī Vēṭūri Prabhākara Śastry Garu and on the ***birudāvaḷi*** preserved in the *Mack. Mss.*, No. 15-5-32.

Bhīma Nāyaka
|
Pōtuganṭi Mailānēḍu or Maili
|
Nāgā Nāyaka
|
Aubhalēndra *alias* Abba Nṛpa (known also as Khaṇḍiyarāya)
|
Vallabha
|
Ganna Nṛpa — Siṅgama Nāyaka (brother-in-law of Rēceṟla Siṅgamanēḍu I) — Kṛṣṇa Nṛpa.

From the *cāṭu* verses we come to know that of all the early chiefs Pōtuganṭi Maili appears to be a powerful Nāyaka. He is said to have defeated the Turuṣkas of Delhi at Upparapalli, a village in the Warangal district, and he is also said in one of the *caṭu* verses that he conquered, later on probably in a duel fight, king Telugu Bijjala of the Solar race in the presence of 'Alā-ud-Dīn, Sultan of Delhi.

"ఢిల్లిలో సురథానుఁ డల్లావదీన్ ధరా
ధృతుండు ప్రత్యక్షసాక్షి గాఁగ......
సూర్యవంశోదయ ఖ్యాతుఁ డార్య తెలుఁగు
బిజ్జల నృపాలుఁ గెల్చెఁ ద ద్భీమబలుఁడు...
ఘనభుజశాలియగు పోతుగంటిమైలి.

The first line was emended by me. The line in the *Cāṭupadya Maṇimañjari* runs thus:

"ఢిల్లిలో సురథానుఁ డొల్లివేదిధరాది [?]
దృతుండు ప్రత్యక్ష సాక్షి గాఁగ"

all hopes of success. When they were unable to hold the fort any longer they resorted to treachery and got Siṅgama Nāyaka assassinated by one Taṁbaḷa Bammajiyya. This landed them in a still greater danger.

On hearing the news of the death of their father Siṅgama Nāyaka, his sons, Anavōtā Nāyaka and Mādā Nāyaka, proceeded by rapid marches to Jallipalli and carried the fort by storm. They avenged the death of their father by massacring in cold blood all the kṣatriyas of the lunar race in the fort along with their allies, in Śaka 1283, that is, 1361 A.D., and assumed the title of *Sōmakulaparaśurāma*, a veritable Paraśurāma to the lunar race.

After his return from this campaign Anavōta made Rājukoṇḍa his capital and carried out some constructions in the fort so as to make it impregnable. Three inscriptions[41] of Anavōta at Rājukoṇḍa, all dated in Śaka 1287 corresponding to the cyclic year Viśvāvasu, (1365A.D.) record the construction by him of stone forts (*kaluhōṭalu*) a reservoir called Anavōta Samudra, wells and other defences of the fort on that hill. These records make it evident that Anavōta was taking all necessary precautions to ensure the safety of his fort and capital against any future enemy attack. It is doubtful if Anavōtā Nāyaka rendered any help to Kāpaya Nāyaka during his wars with the Mussalmāns.

Kāpaya Nāyaka viewed with apprehension the growing power of Anavōtā Nāyaka. No doubt he must have

---

41. VVC., Appendices, Nos. 6, 7 and 8, pp. 27-29. The English date equivalent to the one given in the three records is Sunday, 10th Aug., 1365 A.D.

tried to exercise his authority over him and keep him under check. This made matters worse. Making his position secure after fortifying his fort, Anavōta openly declared war on Kāpaya Nāyaka and suddenly marched with his forces as far as Warangal. Kāpaya Nāyaka's resources were all spent in the war against the Mussalmāns. He was not prepared for this unexpected turn of events. He could not however brook this affront to his authority. He led his army and opposed Anavōtā Nāyaka. A battle was fought at Bhīmavaram in the Warangal taluk of the Warangal district, in which Kāpaya Nāyaka was defeated and slain[42].

Anavōta conquered one after another the great fortresses of Tribhuvanagiri[43] (Bhonāgīr), Ōrugallu (Warangal), Siṅgavaram and others, and became the undisputed monarch of the Teliṅgānā country. After attaining these victories Anavōtā Nāyaka assumed the titles of *Andhradēśādhīśvara* (lord of the Andhra country), *Pratigaṇḍabhairava* (a virtual Bhairava in killing his enemies), *Tribhuvanīrāya Rāvu* Anavōta, and many others. Warangal was reduced to a place of secondary importance.

Peda Vēdagiri Nāyaka, son of Anavōta's brother also claims to have defeated his enemies in the

42. "భీమవరముకడఁ గాపానేనిఁ జంపి" —VV. p. 36.

43. In early times Bhongīr was called Tribhuvanagiri. Saraswatītīrthayati, whose original name was Narahari, and who had written *Kāvyaprakāśaṭīkā* at Benares, is said to have been born in the town of Tribhuvanagiri in the Telugu Country in 1242 A.D.—Vide, Eggeling, *India Office Library Catalogue*, p. 325, No. 1139.

neighbourhood of Warangal or Ēkaśilānagara[44]. This engagement seems to refer to the same battle as the above.

It remains now to determine the date of this battle between Kāpaya Nāyaka and Anavōtā Nāyaka. The Akkalapūṇḍi grant[45] of Siṅgaya Nāyaka refers to the relationship between his elder brother Mummaḍi Nāyaka and *Andhra Suratrāṇa* Kāpaya Nāyaka. It is already known to us that Mummaḍi Nāyaka married the daughter of Kāpaya Nāyaka's sister. This reference to the relationship with such a great and powerful monarch seems to have been made intentionally in order to enhance the prestige of Siṅgaya Nāyaka and his brother Mummaḍi Nāyaka.

If, by the time of that grant, Kāpaya Nāyaka was dead the reference does not carry any weight with it, and is meaningless. Hence, this grant suggests that Kāpaya Nāyaka was alive till 1366 A.D., the date of that grant.[46]

Another record that helps us in determining the date of the battle referred to above, is the Ainavōlu

---

44. VV., p. 37. Peda Vēdagiri is said to have had the title " the forest-fire that burnt the forest of the enemy kings near Ēkaśilānagara "(ఏకశిలా నగర సమీపశాత్రవ రాజన్య[వనదహనదావానల])".

45. E.I., Vol. XIII. p. 259.

46. The gift recorded in the Akkalapūṇḍi grant is said to have been made on the occasion of a Solar eclipse in the month of Śrāvaṇa in Śaka 1290. The cyclic year is not given. The date is irregular. According to the *Indian Ephemeris*, there was no Solar eclipse in the month of Śrāvaṇa between the years Śaka 1289 and 1296. In Śaka 1288 there was one. It is likely that this is the date of the grant.

inscription[47] of Anavōtā Nāyaka. It records that, after returning from a successful military campaign, Anavōtā Nāyaka made a grant of some lands to god Mailāradēva at Ainavōlu near Warangal on Thursday, July 19, 1369 A.D.[48] This inscription clearly states that, at that time, Anavōta was ruling Ōrugallu (Warangal), Tribhuvanagiri (Bhonāgīr), Rājukoṇḍa, and other places in the Telugu country. It is obvious, then, that Anavōtā Nāyaka conquered Kāpaya Nāyaka some time between the date of the Akkalapūṇḍi grant and that of the Ainavōlu inscription, probably about 1367-68 A.D.

With the death of Kāpaya Nāyaka the chapter concerning the rule of the Musunūri princes over Teliṅgānā, comes to a close. Nothing is known about his descendants or other princes of the Musunūri family. Kāpaya Nāyaka's cousin and representative Toyyēṭi Anavōta was killed by Cōḍa Bhaktirāja.

Kāpaya Nāyaka was one of the illustrious generals and rulers of the mediaeval Andhra country. He was a distinguished warrior and a great patriot. He never spared any pains to free the Andhra country from the foreign yoke. His noble nature and adventurous spirit, his intense devotion to the *dharma* and the religion of the land, and above all, his love of independence are well displayed in brilliant colours in the revolt he stirred up in Teliṅgānā against Muhammad bin Tughlaq, the

47. VVC., Appendix, No. 4, p. 20. The text of the inscription contains many mistakes. Some ślōkas were left out.

48. The week day and the tithi as given in this work, are wrong. It is the fifteenth *tithi* of the bright fortnight of the month of Śrāvaṇa in the Cyclic year Saumya, corresponding to Śaka 1291 (Thurs. 19th July, 1369 A.D.).

mighty emperor of Delhi, at a time when all other kings and nobles in the south ineffectually struggled hard to break the iron chains of slavery. Until almost his last years of rule he strove hard to preserve the integrity of Teliṅgānā and the independence of the Hindus which was regained at so much sacrifice. Had Kāpaya Nāyaka and the Rēceṟla princes, Anavōtā Nāyaka and Mādā Nāyaka, joined hands and worked together wholeheartedly and unreservedly for the welfare and the supremacy of the Hindus in Teliṅgānā, setting aside their personal interests and animosities the events of history would have probably taken quite another turn. But it was not destined to be so. The Rēceṟla princes were irrepressible. They were mighty and brave warriors. They stoutly refused to acknowledge the supremacy of, or even to co-operate with, a co-Hindu and as a consequence they reaped, in the long run, the fruits of their unwise policy.

The history of Teliṅgānā from 1369 A.D., until its annexation to the Bahmanī kingdom, is virtually the history of the Rēceṟla princes and their struggle for power, and then for bare existence, with the Bahmanī Sultans of Gulbarga.

APPENDIX I.

THE VILASA GRANT OF PRŌLAYA NĀYAKA.

This grant was discovered long ago in 1856, in the village of Kandarāḍa, near Piṭhāpuram in the East Godavary district by the late Huṇḍi Venkatarao Pantulu garu, but the discovery was made public very recently, only a few years back[1].

This inscription registers the grant of the village of Vilasa in the Kōn = āvanī (that is, Kōnamaṇḍala corresponding to the modern Amalāpuram taluk of the East Godavary district) as an *agrahāra* to the brahman scholar Vennaya, son of Annaya and brother of Gaṇapaya of the Bhāradvāja gōtra, on the occasion of a lunar eclipse (month and year not stated) by Prōlaya Nāyaka of the Musunūri family of the *caturthakula.* Though the year is not given the grant may be assigned to the second quarter of the fourteenth century A. D. Vilasa, the village granted is identical with the village of the same name near Amalāpuram.

The language of this grant is Sanskrit, with the exception of the lines describing the boundaries of Vilasa which are in Telugu.

The complete text of the inscription, omitting the passages relating to the boundaries of the village, is given below with very little emendation.

---

1. Ever since their discovery, these plates were safely preserved in the family of Venkatarao Pantulu garu. They were brought to my notice by their near relative, Śri Sabnivis Satya Kēṣavarao Pantulu garu of Vizagapatam, when I was there a few years ago. Satya Kēśavarao Pantulu garu who is much interested in the history of the Telugu country, took the plates from Śri Hundi Venkatarao Pantulu garu, a descendant of the discoverer, and kindly gave them to me for decipherment and publication. The historians of South India in general, and the Andhra country in particular, are much indebted to Śri Satya Kēśavarao Pantulu garu and Śri Venkatarao Pantulu garu for placing this very valuable document at the disposal of scholars.

TEXT[1]

1. अविघ्नमस्तु ॥ यां प्रेम्णा शशिमौळिना गजमुखो गाढं समालिंगित-श्चापल्या च्छशिनःकल[ां]
2. क[र]तलेनादाय मूर्द्ध्निस्थितां । निक्षिप्येतर दंतसीम्नि समभा त्संलक्ष्य दंतद्वय[ः क*]
3. ल्याणं वितनोतु सा शशिकला विघ्नेश्वरः सोपि वः ॥ [१*] पुष्टिं कुर्षीष्ट वः पोत्री पुराणः पु
4. [रु]षोत्तमः । यद्दंष्ट्राहरिणांकस्य वसुधा लांछनायते ॥ [२*] उपात्त-सत्वो भगवा[ना]
5. [दौ ना]रायणो विभुः । अद्राक्षी दम्मयं विश्व मुन्मीलन्नयनांबुजः ॥ [३*] ततः परीतो
6. [रजसा]गुणेन ब्राह्मी मुपाश्रित्य तनुं महेशः । अकल्पय त्पूर्ववदेव लोका न्सर्वान्
7. कृपार्द्रीकृतचित्तवृत्तिः ॥ [४*] समुद्रद्वीपसंवीता हेमाचलमनोहरा । सर्वेषा मपि
8. लोकानां मध्यस्थेयं वसुंधरा ॥ [५] तस्याश्च रत्नगर्भायाः सर्वस्या मध्यवर्त्तिनं । जं[बू]
9. द्वीपं विदुर्देशं लवणांबुधिवेष्टितं ॥ [६*] द्वीपेपि तस्मि न्नवधा विभक्ते हिमाचला द्दक्षिणमा[स]
10. मुद्रं । भागं भुवो भारतवर्ष माहुः फलंति कर्म्माणि कृतानि यत्र ॥ [७*] भाषा[स]
11. माचारभिदाविभिन्ने देशै रनेकै र्बहुधा विभक्ते । वर्षे च तस्मिन् कमनीयवास स्तिलिंगना[मो]
12. स चकास्ति देशः ॥ [८*] महर्धिरम्याणि पुराणि नद्यः पुण्योदका रम्यतरा महीध्राः । वना न्य

---

1. From the original plates. The script is Telugu.

13. सेव्या न्यतला स्तटाका दुर्गाण्यधृष्याणि च संति यत्र ॥ [९*] एवं विधा मंबुधिमेखलां ता

14. मपीपलन् धर्मनयक्रमेण । सोमार्कवंश्या नरपालवर्य्याः पुराणसिद्धाः पुरुहूत

15. भासः ॥ [१०*]

16. गतेषु तेषु क्षितिपालकेषु क्षितीश्वराः काकतिवंशजाताः । काले कलौ संप्रतिवर्त्तमाने ति

17. लिंग माश्थाय शशासु रुर्वीं ॥ [११*] तेषा मेकशिलानामनगरी पृथिवी क्षितां । इक्ष्वाकू

18. णा मयोध्येव रम्याभूत्कुलवासभूः ॥ [१२*] कालक्रमात् प्रयातेषु तेष्वनल्पपरा

19. क्रमः । प्रतापरुद्रो नृपतिः पालयामास मेदिनीं ॥ [१३*] सर्वेपि दान प्रवणा मनुष्या

20. द्विजातयो यज्ञपरा स्समस्ताः । कलि स्तदासीत् कृतकालचिह्नो यस्मि-न्महीं शासति

21. वीररुद्रे ॥ [१४*] यस्ति(स्मि)न्महीं शासति शासनांकां प्रजाः प्रजा-पालनकर्मदक्षे । नास्मार्षु राद्या न्न

22. रपालमुख्यान्ययातिनाभागभगीरथाद्यान् ॥ [१५*] अथैवं शासता तेन तु[रु*]ष्काणा

23. मधीश्वरः । अहंमदुसुरत्राणो महद्वैरं समाचरत् ॥ [१६*] भूपालल यका

24. लेन येन निश्शेषतां गताः । जामदग्न्येन रामेण हतशेषा महीभृतः ॥ [१७*] वीरोद्भटभट

25. स्सोपि वीररुद्रः प्रतापवान् । अजय त्सप्तकृत्व स्तं नवलक्षाश्वसाधनं ॥ [१८*] नीतिप्रशास्तो

26. पि बलाधिकोपि सहाययुक्तोपि च वीररुद्रः । भाग्यक्षते मानुषमंड-लस्य तुरुष्कभर्तु

27. र्वशता मयासीत् ॥ [१९*] स नीयमानो नगरीं स्वकीयां ढिल्लीं प्रयत्ना द्यवनेश्वरेण [।*] सोमो

28. द्भवायाः सरितः प्रतीरे दैवा दयासी त्रिदशाधिवासं ॥ [२०*] प्रतापरुद्रतिग्मांशौ लोकांतरति

29. रोहिते। तुरुष्कांधतमिस्रेण समाक्रांतं महीतलं ॥ [२१*] प्रतापरुद्रेण परं परा

30. स्तो रिपू नधर्मो यवनान् गतोनु। नोचे द्रुतेस्मिन् यवनैस्सहैव कथं निराबाधसुखं

31. जजृंभे ॥ [२२*] केचिद्धनाढ्याः परिबाध्यमाना धनाय पापै र्विविधैरुपायैः। केचि न्निरीक्ष्यैव च पारशीका

32. न् पर्य्यत्यजन् प्राणनभस्वतोन्ये ॥ [२३*] द्विजातय स्त्याजितकर्मबंधा भग्नाश्च देवप्रतिमा स्स

33. मस्ताः। विद्वद्वरिष्टै श्चिरकालभुक्ता स्सर्वे व्यपाहारिषताग्रहाराः ॥ [२४*] आत्ते कर्षणलाभे पा

34. पैर्य्यवनै र्बलात्कारात्। दीनादीनकुटुंबाः कृषीवला नाशमापंनाः(पन्नाः)॥ [२५*] धनदारा

35. [दिके] नृणां कस्मिंश्चिदपिवस्तुनि। स्वायत्ततामति र्नाभू द्भुवि तस्यां महाप

36. [दि]॥ [२६*] [पेया] सुरा गोपिशितं च भोज्यं लीलाविहारो द्विजघातनं च। अश्रांत मासी द्यवना

37. धमानां कथंनु जीवे द्भुवि जीवलोकः ॥ [२७*] इत्थं तैर्य्यवनभटैः प्रबाध्यमानं तैलिंगं ध

38. रणितलं सुरारिकल्पैः। त्रात(ता)रं कमपि हृदा व्यविंदमानं संतेपे वनमिव दाववह्नि

39. जुष्टं ॥ [२८*] अनंतरं संप्रति यावनीं ता मालोक्य पीडा मनुकंपमानः। अंशावती

40. र्णो भगवानिवाद्यः प्रोलक्षितीशो वसुधां बिभर्त्ति ॥ [२९*] पुंसः पुराणस्य पदा दुदीर्ण्ण(र्ण) व

41. र्णे य माहुः कलिकालवर्य्यं। तत्र प्रशस्तो मुसुनूरिवंशो यज्जन्मधाम [प्रथ]

42. ते पृथिव्यां ॥ [३०*] स प्रोलभूपो मुसुनूरिवंश्य स्तथाविधं यावन
    माधिपत्यं ।

43. विश्वोपजीव्येन विशृंखळेन व्यनीनश द्वाहुबलेन वीरः ॥ [३१*] नामा
    स्य तेषां यवनाध

44. मानां मंत्रः कि मुच्चाटनकर्मकारी । दीना यदुच्चारणमात्रत स्ते दुर्ग्गाणि
    संत्य

45. ज्य कुतो[प्य]भूवन् ॥ [३२*] याः प्रजा स्समबाध्यंत यवनै स्ता
    मनूपमं । प्रभवंत[2]

46. त[मे]वाग्रु र्निदाघार्ता इव ह्रदं ॥ [३३*] ये पीडिता स्तुरुष्कै रनारतं
    मा

47. नुषा घोरं । ते तानेव निजघ्नु र्बलमाश्रयजं महत्ख्यातं ॥ [३४*]इत्थं प

48. रास्य प्रबलं प्रपंचं यावनं बली । नष्ट मापदि कष्टायां धर्म्मं पुनरवी
    वृतत् ॥ [३५*]

49. अपाहृतांस्तै रतिपापचारैः प्रत्तान् पुराणै र्मनुजेंद्रवर्य्यैः । अने[क]शः
    पूर्व

50. ह(म)हीसुरेभ्यः प्रोलक्षितीशोददताग्रहारान् ॥ [३६*] कृत्वा प्रवृत्तान्
    विरतप्रसंगान् य

51. [ज्ञान्] हविर्धूमपरंपराभिः । तुरुष्कसंचारणजातपापानांध्रान् प्रदेशान

52. नघानकार्षीत् ॥ [३७*] कृषीवलाश्चापि कृषेः फलानां यथोदितं भाग-
    मदुः प्रहृ[ष्टा]

53. ः । तपस्विन ष्षष्ठमिव प्रभागं पृथ्वीभुजेस्मै तपसः फलानां ॥ [३८*]
    यद्यत्कृतं पारशी

54. कै(ः) र्व्यत्यस्तं धरणीतले । तत्तत्सर्वं यथापूर्वं व्यरीरच्च दयं बली ॥
    [३९*] इत्थं[2]

55. प्रोलमहीवरेण बलिना सर्व्वंसहेयं चिरात्कष्टाया यवनेंद्रघो

56. रनिकृते स्संमोच्य हस्ते धृता । संतुष्टा सुकृतोपचारविधिभि र्विस्मृत्य
    पूर्वा [न्*]

2. The *anusvāra* is written in the next line.

57. नृपां [स्त]स्मिन् भावमनन्यगं वितनुते सौस्थित्यसंदर्शितं ॥ [४०*]
तस्यास्ति तस्यां भुवि रा

58. जधानी महीभृतो माल्यवतस्समीपे । गोदावरीप्रांतभुवि प्रशस्तां

59. यां रेकपल्लीति वदंति देश्याः [॥ ४१* ॥] दानभोगोपयोगाभि स्सर्वा-
भि र्वसुभूरि

60. भिः । यातिचक्राम नगरी (म)मलकां चामरावतीं ॥ [४२*] मुक्ताफलै
र्विद्रुमभंगजाल

61. कै र्मणिव्रजै रुं(रु)न्नतहेमराशिभिः । ऋद्धापणा या सततं विराजते
धनेश्वरस्ये

62. व च भांडगेहभूः ॥ [४३*] सता मधिष्ठाय पुरीं समृद्धां प्रोलक्षितीशः
पुरुहू

63. [त तेजा] [:*] अपास्तवैरिक्षितिपाललोकां प्रशमस्ति पृथ्वीं निजशास-
नांकां ॥ [४४*] यद्धाटी

64. षु वलत्तुरंगमखुरप्रोद्यद्रजोमंडलीविस्तारैः परिधूसरालकभरप्रां[3]

65. ता दिशायोषितः । दृष्ट्वा भ्रांति मवाप्नुवंति महतीं गंधर्वकन्या मु

66. हु र्भीत्या दूरतरप्रधावदहितक्ष्मापालयोषा इति ॥ [४५*] यत्प्रताप
तपने

67. न विह्वला वैरिणः क्षितिभृतो महीयसा । पादपद्मनखचंद्ररोहिणीं[3]

68. शीत[लां] परिचरंति चंद्रिकां ॥ [४६ ॥] यद्बाहुपीठं संप्राप्य प्रतापो-
ष्मळमु

69. न्नतं । त्यजत्यंबुधिसंवासक्लेश मद्य वसुंधरा ॥ [४७*] अरत्नमौळी
परिदंतु

70. रेषु निरातपत्रावरणेषु यस्य । आज्ञानटी नृत्यति भूपतीनां मूं(मू)र्द्धा

71. ग्ररंगेषु समुन्नतेषु ॥ [४८*] आरोपितगुणं यस्य धनु स्सापत्न्यशंकया ।
ल(अ)रिरा

72. जन्यकांतानां कंठस्थानलुना द्गुणान् ॥ [४९*] तस्याभवन् कापयनायका

73. द्या स्सुभ्रातर श्शौर्य्यनयोपपंनाः(पन्नाः) । येषु प्रतिष्ठाप्य धुरंधरायाः

3. The *anusvāra* is written in the next line.

74. प्रभु स्स धर्मार्जनतत्परोभूत् ॥ [५०*] महीसुरेभ्यः कलिकालवर्य्यं तं दा
75. नरूपं परमं विदित्वा । प्रादा त्प्रशस्तान् बहुशोग्रहारान् महां
76. ति दानान्यकरो द्बहूनि ॥ [५१*] ये सूरय स्संति महीतलेस्मिन् सत्पात्र
भूता
77. वसुभूरि तेषु । दत्वा(त्त्वा)तिपात्रे प्रतिपादनाय व्यचाययत्तज्जगतोतलँ
78. द्रः ॥ [५२*] भारद्वाजो मुनिः पूर्वमभवद्वेदविश्रुतः । प्रथतेनुत्तमं
गोत्रं य
79. दुपज्ञं महीतले ॥ [५३*] तद्गोत्रेन्नयविदुषः पौत्रः पुत्र श्च वेन्नयार्य्य
80. स्य । अन्नयनामा विद्वानभवत(त्) ख्यातो यजुर्वेदी ॥ [५४*] वेन्नयगणप
81. यविबुधौ तत्पुत्रौ जगति विश्रुतख्यातौ । यत्पादपद्मसंगा द्धरणिरि
82. यं धन्यतां धत्ते ॥ [५५*] त्रिविष्टपादेत्य गुरुस्सुराणां पाताळलोका
त्फणिनां[4]
83. पतिश्च । सौभ्रात्रसौख्यानुभवाय भूमिं संप्राप्तवंताविव यौ वि
84. भातः ॥ [५६*] ज्येष्ठस्तयो र्वेन्नयसूरिवर्य्यः प्रशस्तविद्याविनयाभिरामः ।
विस्ता
85. रिभिर्य्यः क(कु)मुदावदातै र्य्यशोभिराशा स्सुरभीकरोति ॥ [५७*]
यत्पादपंकेरु
86. हपार्श्वनम्रक्षितीश्वरश्रेणिललाटलग्ना । ब्राह्मी लिपि र्भाग्यवदास्फुरद्भि
र्नखांशुजा
87. लै स्सुवचत्वमेति ॥ [५८*] यत्रास्ति विद्या न च तत्र लक्ष्मीर्य्यत्रास्ति
लक्ष्मी र्नच तत्र विद्या । वि
88. द्या च लक्ष्मी श्च विहाय वैरं यस्मि न्नुभे ते वसतः प्रहृष्टे ॥ [५९*]
भोगादनन्तरं दा
89. नं प(प्र)सिद्धं पृथिवीतले । त्यक्त्वा भोगं वितरणं यस्मिन्नेव विजृंभते ॥
[६०*] यद्दा
90. नलक्ष्मीसंप्राप्तिबुध्या स्वर्लोकधेनवः । ऊर्ध्वपादा श्चरंतीव चिरं घो
91. रतरं तपः ॥ [६१*] यस्मा दवाप्तै र्बहुभिस्सुवर्णै रनारतानुष्ठितयाग

4. The *anusvāra* is written in the next line.

92. तंत्राः । विभांति भूमौ विमलप्रचारा यशःपताका इव यायजू

93. काः ॥ [६२*] विप्रेभ्यो विधिव द्धेनूः प्रदत्वो(त्त्वो)ब(भ)यतोमुखीः । यः करोति निजां कीर्तिं न्निर्मलां[5]

94. सर्वतोमुखीं ॥ [६३*] यन्निपृ(?सृ)ष्टाग्रहारेषु प्रतितिष्ठंति भूसुराः । पदवाक्यप्रमा

95. णज्ञा धर्मस्तंभा इवोच्छ्रिताः ॥ [६४*] कृतेषु दानेषु महत्सु येन विश्वास विभ्राजितमानि

96. सेन चिराय दानप्रतिपादकानि प्रयान्ति शास्त्राणि यथार्त्थभावं ॥ [६५*] निश्चित्य

97. तं प्रोलनृपोतिपात्रं संप्रार्त्थयद्ग्रामवरं ग्रहीतुं । प्रतिग्रहात् सोपि निवृत्तचेता

98. स्तत्पक्षपातेन कथंचि दैच्छत् ॥ [६६*] ततोनुगोदावरि तुष्टचेता ग्रहे विधोः प्रादिशदग्रहा

99. रं । कोनावनीमंडलना(सा)रभूतं ग्रामं स तस्मै विलसाभिधानं ॥ [६७*] विभांति यस्या

100. तिपचेळिमानि क्षेत्राणि शालीक्षुवणोचितानि । आरामभागाश्च भुजंगवल्लीरंभा

101. म्रपूगीपनसादिरम्याः ॥ [६८*] त मग्रहारं प्रतिगृह्य तस्मात् प्रोल-क्षितीशादथ वेन्नया

102. र्यः सहानुजोदित्सत भूसुरेभ्यः प्रदत्तये तस्य धनार्जनं हि ॥ [६९*] अनेकशास्त्रार्ण

103. वकर्णधारान् वेदाध्वसन्लंघनजांघिकान् सः । प्रसिद्धशीलाचरणा भिजात्या न

104. यूथय द्विप्रवरांश्चिरेण ॥ [७०*] ऐश्वर्यभोगैर्य्युतमष्टसंख्यै स्त मं कयि

105. त्वा नृपतेश्च नाम्ना । अष्टोत्तरेण प्रविभज्य भागैश्शतेन सोदा त्सुमति द्विंजेभ्यः ॥ [७१*]

---

5. The *anusvāra* is written in the next line.

106. अथात्र भागिनां नामशाखादिर्गोत्रवर्गशः । प्रवर्ण्यते समासेन भाग
संख्या च

107. भागिनां ॥ [७२*] सर्वेपि भागिनोर्हंति प्राथम्यं गुणवत्तमाः ।
तथापि क्रमवृत्तित्वा द्वा

108. चो मे नात्र मूढता ॥ [७३*] श्री ॥ उपाध्यायो देचिभट्टः पदवाक्य
प्रमाणवित् । मल्लिकूचि

109. मंनीषीच याजुषौ कपिगोत्रजौ ॥ [७४*] पेद्दभावनभट्टश्च पाणिनि
श्शब्दशासने । सुधो श्चुलिकितापारगं

110. श्रीरंगणितार्णवः ॥ [७५*] पेद्दशिङ्गयभट्टश्च ज्योतिर्द्दृष्टजगद्विधः ।
कलिताखिलवाग्जालः प्राज्ञो भ

111. द्रबुधाग्रणीः ॥ [७६*] पिनभावनभट्टश्च वाग्मी नृपतिवल्लभः ।
ज्योतिश्शास्त्रं महद्यस्य तृतीय

112. मिव लोचनं ॥ [७७*] विद्वज्जननुतप्रज्ञ स्सभार्हः पिनशिङ्गयः । मल्लय
श्चेमकूरोपपदो

113. दामयकोविदः ॥ [७८*] ज्योतिर्वित्सोमयार्यश्च मंचिभट्टश्च केशवः ।
जक्कयाख्या

114. पको धीमान् भास्करः पिन्नयस्सुधीः ॥ [७९*] गड्डपल्ली पेद्दिभट्ट
श्शब्दशास्त्रपतंजलिः । तेत्तिरो

115. पपदोपेता विठ्ठयाप्पलुयज्ञमाः ॥ [८०*] अध्यापकाश्चेन्नयाख्य
स्सतताध्या

116. पनोत्तरः । श्रीकंठपदसंसेवी श्रीकंठविबुधाग्रणी(ः) ॥ [८१*] आदित्य
स्सत्यमादित्यः प्र

117. ह्वप्रौढतमोपहः । पम्मप्पलुर्नागस्वामिमनीषी शिंगया वुभौ ॥ [८२*]
नृसिं

118. हभट्टोपाध्यायः कविर्वेदांतपारगः । याजुषा आर्च एकस्तु पेद्दया
ध्याप

119. कोत्तमः ॥ [८३*] षड्विंशति द्विजा एते भारद्वाजकुलोद्भवाः । सोमाय
भट्टोपाध्याय स्स्मृति

120\. ज्ञः केशवसुधीः ॥ [८४*] पोतप्पयाध्यापकश्च धर्मशास्त्रकृतश्रमः । शिंगप्पयाध्याप

121\. कश्च शिष्यसंक्रामितागमः ॥ [८५*] रामयाध्यापको मंच्यप्पल्लसोमप्प-योन्वयः । नारा

122\. यणाध्यापकश्च मल्लुभट्टश्च याजुषाः ॥ [८६*] विद्वान् सिंहगिरिश्च द्वादश कौंडिन्यगोत्रजाः

123\. गोविंदाध्यापकन्सा(स्सा)धु नागयाध्यापकोपरः ॥ [८७*] बोल्लिभट्ट श्चागमेषु प्रौढो गणित

124\. मर्मवित् । रामयो गणितब्रह्मबिरुद स्सूरयस्सुधीः ॥ [८८*]अध्यापको नरहरि(श्च) ग(र्ग)न्न

125\. याध्यापकोत्तमः । सूरिभट्टश्च यजुषि शूरा आचौंतु कामयः ॥ [८९*] पळपोताध्या

126\. पकश्च दशकाश्यपगोत्रजाः । पलुकुर्कप्पलेभट्टः पद्मनाभश्च वल्लभः ॥ [९०*] त्रिविक्रमसुधीर्य्या

127\. गतंत्रविद्याजुषा इमे । अनंतभट्टो वेदांतशब्दशास्त्रकृतश्रमः ॥ [९१*] कामया

128\. ध्यापक श्चार्चौ हारिता ष्षडिमे द्विजाः । यजुरंबुधिपारज्ञौ गुरुतंत्र विशारदौ ॥ [९२*]

129\. सुधियावीश्वरावेतौ द्वौ पराशरगोत्रजौ । वेलुपल्लि पोचनार्य्य[ः*] स्वाधीनयजुरा

130\. गमः ॥ [९३*] ना[रा*]यणप्पयश्चार्चौ द्वौ वाधूलकुलोद्भवौ । सांगे बह्वृचिनिष्णा

131\. तो वेदे वेन्नयसंज्ञकः ॥ [९४*] गंगयार्य्यौ यजुश्शूरो द्वौ व्रसिष्ठ कुलोद्भवौ ।

132\. पुंनयाध्यापक श्चार्च एकः कौशिकगोत्रजः ॥ [९५*] यजुर्नि गमनिर्वोढा चिट्टयो गौ

133\. तमान्वयः । क्लुप्तद्विविधमीमांसस्तीर्णव्याकरणांबुधिः ॥ [९६*] वैकुंठभट्टोपाध्यायः

134. कविरश्वरतंत्रवित् । रामायभट्टश्च यजु [:*]ख्यातावात्रेयगोत्रजौ ॥
[९७*] अप्पायभट्टोपा

135. ध्यायो ज्योतिर्ज्ञोनंतकोविदः । शब्दशासनवित्पोतिभट्ट स्ति
प्पयसंज्ञकः ॥ [९८*] वैयासिकम

136. तत्प्रौढः सुधीर्विश्वेश्वराभिधः । चुक्कभोट्टाधि(दि)कौ मल्लिकूचि मल्लय
पे[द्दयौ] ॥ [९९*] सुधियौ

137. याजुषाविप्रा स्सप्तश्रीवत्सगोत्रजाः । बोल्लयाध्यापको धीमा न्केशवश्च
यजुर्विदौ ॥ [१००*] मैत्रे

138. योत्थौ गार्ग्यगोत्रो याजुषो विस्सयस्सुधीः । तंगेळळपल्ल्यभिजनः
पोचनाध्यापकोत्तमः ॥ [१०१*]

139. म[ा़मा]रयश्च यजुश्शूरौ द्वौ शांडिल्यकुलोद्भवौ । पेद्भावनभट्टश्च पेद
शिद्धयभद्र्यौ ॥ [१०२*]

140. सपा[दा]र्धद्वादशांशा स्त्रय स्संभूय सोदराः । तन्मात्रभागकौ द्वौ च
पिनभावनशिद्ध

141. यौ ॥ [१०३*] चुक्कभोट्टादिको मल्लिकूचि स्सार्धद्विभागकः । अप्पाय
भट्टोपाध्यायौ(यो) ज्योति

142. र्ज्ञोनंतकोविदः ॥ [१०४*] सदेचिभट्टोपाध्यायो विद्वान् सिंहगिरिः
परः । अध्यापकावुभौ पोत

143. प्पयशिंगप्पयौ द्विजौ ॥ [१०५*] वेलुपल्लीपोचनार्य्य इति सप्तद्वि
भागकाः । मल्लायपेद्दिश्रीकंठादि

144. त्या स्सार्धैकभागकाः ॥ [१०६*] मंचयप्पल्लू शिंगयौच पेद्दयाध्याप-
कोप्यमी । पंचार्धभागका वि

145. प्रा श्शेषास्त्वेकैकभागिनः ॥ [१०७*] एकैकभागकौ देवौ गौतमेश्वर
केशवौ । अशीतिरेवमभवन् प्रतिग्रह

146. युजो द्विजाः ॥ [१०८*] सग्रामदेवा भागास्तु जाता श्चाष्टोत(त्त)रंशतं॥
अथ सीमानिर्णयः । [।*]

APPENDIX II.

THE KALUVACĒṚU GRANT OF ANITALLI.

This grant was discovered in the village of Āryavaṭam in the Cocanada taluk of the East Godavary district. It was published in the journal of the Telugu Academy (A.S.P.P.), Vol. IV, pages, 93 to 112. It registers the grant of the village of Kaluvacēṛu to the Āyurvēdic physician, Parahitācārya, son of Kāḷanāthabhaṭṭa by Anitalli, wife of Vīrabhadrā Reḍḍi, king of Rājamahēndravaram, in the Śaka year, 1345, on the eighth *tithi* of the dark fortnight in the month of Śrāvaṇa. The following verses are taken from it (lines 27 to 42).

अथ सा रुद्रमदेवी प्रतापरुद्रे हृतारिनृपभद्रे
दौहित्रे सुचरित्रे सर्वामुर्वीं निधाय मुदितवती ॥ 23

तस्मिन् राजनि शासति क्षितितलं भूमंडलाखंडले
भृत्यामात्यसुहृन्निजद्विजबुधाचार्य्यादय स्संमताः
तल्लक्ष्मीमुदिता स्वमन्दिरगता श्शत्रुक्षितीशाः पुन
र्वेलाकाननशैलकन्दरगता स्तत्कीर्त्तिवित्रासिताः ॥ 24

विद्याविशेषै र्विनयोपचारै र्वितीर्णिभि र्विश्वजनोपकारैः
विद्वन्निकायो विततप्रतापे विद्योतते वीतरजस्यमुष्मिन् ॥ 25

गजपतिरुत्कळनाथः पाश्चात्याधीश्वरोश्वपतिः
ताभ्यां नरपतिरधिकः प्रतापरुद्रो यत स्त्रिलिंगेशः ॥ 26

तस्मिन् प्रतापरुद्रे स्वस्थानं स्वेच्छयैव यातवति
अथ सा भू र्य्यवनमयी जातैवाहोमहामहोमहिमा ॥ 27

वराहवद्वारिधिवारिमग्नां धरामशेषां यवनोदरस्थां
समुद्धरन् प्रोळयनायकेंद्र स्ततः प्रतिष्ठापयतिस्म तद्वत् ॥ 28

स्वर्गातिथौ प्रोलयभूमिपाले विश्वेश्वराज्ञामधिगम्य गत्वा
अपालयत्कापयनायकेंद्र स्तद्दिव्यराज्यं तरणिप्रतापः ॥ 29

अथ पंचोत्तरसप्ततिनायकसंसेव्यमानपदपद्मः
कापावनीश्वरः श्रीविश्वेश्वरकरुणया क्षिति मरक्षत् ॥ 30

तुरुष्कै र्यैं समाक्रांता स्तेचान्ये कापभूभुजा
अग्रहाराः पुनर्दत्ता भूयो भुव मभूषयन् ॥ 31

विश्वेश्वराय विविधां प्रविधाय सेवां
याते विभौ दिवि च तत्पदसेवनाय
तैर्नायकै स्स्वनगराण्यधिगम्य सर्वैं
स्संरक्षिता गतविरोधकथै स्स्वदेशाः ॥ 32

तेषां वेमनरेश्वरः क्षितिभुजां धर्म्मात्मनामग्रणी
इशश्वद्धारतदिव्यपूरुषकथाधौतांतरंगस्सुधीः
श्रीमत्पंटकुलोद्भवश्शिवपदद्वंद्वैकसेवापरो
विप्राशीर्वचनोन्नतो जितरिपुस्फूर्जत्प्रतापोदयः ॥ 33

APPENDIX III.

[PRŌLAVARAM GRANT OF KĀPAYA NĀYAKA.]

This is C.P., No. 3 of 1934-35. This was edited by me in J. B. O. R. S., Vol. XX (1934), pp. 260 ff, and by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya in the Telugu Journal, Bhārati (1934).

This set was discovered at Guraza in the Guḍivāḍa taluk, Kistna district. It consists of two copper-plates bearing writing on both sides of each plate. It registers the grant of the village of Prōlavaram on the banks of the river, Malaghnī, for the merit of Prōlaya Nāyaka in Śaka 1267, corresponding to the Cyclic year, Pārthiva, at the time of the solar eclipse in the month of Māgha by Kāpaya Nāyaka who lived at Ēkaśilānagarī or Warangal. The donee was the brahman Kandaya Peddi Bhaṭṭa of the Śaunaka gōtra who performed a *satra-yāga* in the vicinity of Śrīśaila. He wrote a commentary on a work called *Girīśasahasraka*.

The river Malaghnī was rightly identified by the Superintendent of Epigraphy, Southern Circle (Ep. Rep., 1934-35, p. 74, para. 52) with the river Malāpahā of the Jujjavaram plates of Anavēma, dated in Śaka 1293 (C.P., No. 23 of 1922-23), which register the grant of Dṛjjavaram. Three villages, namely, Prōlavaram, Dṛjjavaram and Kōḍūru are known so far to be situated on the banks of the river Malāpahā or Malaghnī. Of the three villages mentioned above Kōḍūru, the last one was granted to brahmans by the Reḍḍi king, Anavōta in

Śaka 1280. Since Dṛjjavaram and Kōḍūru are identical with the present villages of Jujjavaram and Kōḍūru in the Guḍivāḍa taluk the river Malāpahā or Malaghnī and the village Prōlavaram have to be looked for in the same taluk. There is a zamīndāri village, Prōlavaram in the Guḍivāḍa taluk which may be identical with Prōlavaram, the village granted by Kāpaya Nāyaka.

TEXT[1]

FIRST PLATE, FIRST SIDE

1. भव्याज्जगंति विभुरादिवराहमूर्त्ति [।*] भंर्त्ता भुवो रुचिर बा
2. लतमाल नीलः । आविर्बभूव किल यस्य महांबुलीने [।*] दंष्ट्राग्रुणा
3. लशिखरे धरणीसरोजं[2] । [।*] आसीत्पोतमहीपतिस्सुकृतिनामाद्यो ज
4. गत्त्रिश्रुतः [।*] पोतः कल्पमहीरुहस्य विलसद्विश्राणान[3] श्लाघया [।*] पोतो
5. यं[4] विपदंबुराशितरणे सर्व्वप्रजानामपि [।*] क्षीराब्धाविव चंद्रमा
6. बुधजनाधार श्चतुर्त्तान्वये[5] ॥ तस्यामभूवं[6]स्तनया गुणाढया [।*]
7. श्चतुर्भुजस्येव भुजामहांतः[7] ॥ पोचक्षितीशो नरदेवमुख्यो [।*] देवश्च
8. कामाधिपराजभूपौ[8] ॥ पोचक्षोणिपते स्सुतौ सुकृतिनौ प्रोलक्षितीशोत्त

---

1. From the plates.
2. Metre : वसन्ततिलक.
3. Read 'द्विश्राण'.
4. Read 'पोतोयो'.
5. Read •श्चतुर्थान्वये'. Metre: शार्दूलविक्रीडितम्.
6. Read 'तस्यह्यभूवं.
7. One line is enough.
8. Metre: इन्द्रवज्र.

9. मः [।*] श्लाध्यश्री[9] रेऱ्[10]पोतभूपतिरवि(पि) द्वौ लोकसंभावितौ ।
देवक्ष्माधिपतेश्च का

10. पनृपतिश्रीमुम्मडीशाह्वयौ [।*] संजातौ भुवि रामलक्ष्मणनिभौ
सुर्ये[11] ।

FIRST PLATE, SECOND SIDE

11. दुतुल्यश्रियौ[12] । [।*] कामक्षितीशतनयौ पुनरिम्मडीश [।*] देवप्र-
भू भुवनवि

12. श्रुतदानशीलौ । पत्रोपि[13] राजनृपतेरनवोतभूप [।*] स्तोय्येटिनामन

13. गरीपतिरार्यबंध्धुः[14] ॥ एतेषां सहजन्मनां सुकृतिनां मध्ये प्रसि

14. ध्धोधयः[15] [।*] क्षोणीचक्रमवक्रविक्रमयशस्संभाव्यबाहार्गळः । एक
छत्रमपा[16]

15. लयद् बुधजनश्लाघ्यप्रभावोन्नतो [।*] लक्ष्मीवान्मुघुनूरिप्रोलनृपति
स्सध्वं

16. धु[17] चिंतामणिः[18] ॥ तस्यानंतर मंत्ररंग[19]विमलो भावप्रभावो

17. दयः [।*] श्लाघ्यप्रस्फुटधर्म्मकर्म्म[20]चतुर [ः] श्रीकापपृथ्वी[21]पतिः ।
काश्यां विश्वप

---

9. Read 'श्लाघ्यश्री॰.

10. Telugu ṟ is represented by a horizontal line beneath it

11. Read 'सूर्यै॰. The mark at the end is unnecessary

12. Metre: शार्दूलविक्रीडितम्.

13. Read 'पुत्रोपि'.

14. Read ॰रार्यबंधुः'. Metre: वसन्ततिलक.

15. Read ॰प्रसिद्धोदयः'.

16. Read 'एकच्छत्र॰.

17. Read स्सद्बंधुचिंतामणि':.

18. Metre: शार्दूलविक्रीडितम्.

19. Read ॰मंतरंग॰.

20. Read धर्मकर्म॰.

21. Read पृथ्वीं.

18. तेः प्रसादमहिमा[22]प्राप्ताखिलप्राभवः [।*] क्षोणीरक्षणभ्रक्षधाक्षिण[23] भुजस्तंभो जरी

19. जृंभते[24] [।*] प्रतापरुद्रप्रतिमप्रभावः श्रीकापभूपः करुणाकलापः। अशा

20. दशेषां भुवमद्भुतश्रीरेकोवसन्नेकशिलानगर्यां[25] [।*] आसीन्नेमिशना

21. मपावनवनावोसो[26] महासंयमी [।*] व्यासद्वादशवर्षसत्रमहिमा

SECOND PLATE, FIRST SIDE

22. व्यासेतिहासप्रियः। अंहस्संघभयानकस्त्रिभुवने सद्वान[27] कीर्त्या

23. नकः [।*] क्षामक्षीणसमस्तदीनजनतासंत्तानकश्शौनकः[28] [*॥] तस्यान्वये ज

24. यङि[29] कंदयपेद्दिभट्टः [।*] श्रीशैलसीम्नि कृतविश्रुत[30]सत्रयागः। व्याख्या

25. नकृ द्विरिशनामसहस्रकस्य [।*] पंचाग्रहारपरिराक्षितबंधुवर्ग्गः[31] ॥

26. शाकाब्दे गिरितर्क्क[32]भानुगणिते संवतृरे[33] पार्त्तिवे[34] [।*] माघेमासि रविप्र

22. Read 'महिम'.

23. Read •दक्षदक्षिण•.

24. Metre: शार्दूलविक्रीडितम्.

25. Read •नगर्यां•. Metre: उपेन्द्रवज्र.

26. Read •न्नैमिशनामपावनवनावासो•.

27. Read •सद्दान•.

28. Metre: शार्दूलविक्रीडितम्.

29. Read 'जयति'.

30. The writer first forgot to write त. So, he put a plus mark below between श्रु and स and has written त above.

31. Read •वर्गः'. Metre: वसन्ततिलक.

32. Read •तर्क•.

33. Read 'संवत्सरे'.

34. Read 'पार्थिवे'.

27. हे सुचरित [:*] श्रीकापपृथ्वी[35]पतिः । श्रीमत्प्रोलमहीपतेस्सुकृतिनः

28. पुण्याय पुण्याशयः [।*] ग्रामं प्रोलवराह्वयं स्वय म

29. दा त्तस्मै मलघ्नीतटे[36] । [।*] लस्य[37] ग्रामस्य सीमाचिह्नानि ॥ तूर्पुनकु ॥

30. दक्षिणमुखमै पाऱिन पेद्दकोड्डुसीम । दक्षिणानकु । आकोड्डु

31. दग्गऱ् वच्चिन पोतुगट्टु[38] पड्डुमऱ् मुखमै पोयि कुनिवडि [द*]

SECOND PLATE, SECOND SIDE

32. क्षिणमुखमुगा सागि मांकिगुंटलोपलगा वच्चि कुानवडि

33. दक्षिणमै पोयि मलंगि येड्वप्पि मोच्चि पड्डुमऱ् मुखमै

34. सागिन पोतुगट्टुमलंगि पेद्दवप्पि मोचेनु ॥ पड्डुमटिकिनि उत्त

35. रमुमुखमै सागिन पोतुगट्टु जम्मिकडंगानु तूर्पु

36. मोगमै मलंगि येप्पटिन्नि उत्तरपुमोगमै वच्चि कुनिव

37. डि पड्डुमऱ् मुखमै सागि पेद्ददोड्डिलोनुगा वच्चि तुम्म

38. लपुट्ट मोचेनु ॥ उत्तरानकु तूर्पुमोगमुगा वच्चिन पोतुग

39. ट्टु उप्पिपोदलुसीमगानु कुंटकड पुट्टवंपुगानु उत्त

40. रपुमोगमुगा मलंगि लिंगमुगुंट्टकडंगानु सा

41. गि तूर्पुन पेद्दकोड्डु मोचेनु ॥

---

35. Read 'पृथ्वी'.

36. Metre: शार्दूलविक्रीडितम्.

37. Read 'अस्य'.

38. Read 'पोतुगड्ड'.

APPENDIX IV

THE ORDER AND CHRONOLOGY OF THE CAMPAIGNS OF THE BAHMANĪ SULTĀN, MUHAMMAD SHĀH I.

Muhammad Shāh I, son of 'Alā-ud-dīn Hasan Bahman Shāh was a worthy successor of his father on the throne of Gulbarga. After ascending the throne he introduced many reforms into the administration of the kingdom. That he was a capable administrator of no ordinary type is borne out by the fact that the institutions he founded in re-organising the civil and military administration of the kingdom, endured as long as the Bahmanī kingdom existed. With the desire 'of conquering countries and cities' he revived, according to Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad, 'the customs of religious warfare (*Jehād*)'. According to the Muslim chroniclers Muhammad Shāh I never knew what defeat was in all the campaigns he had undertaken, and in the words of Ferishta, 'no prince before him ever so far reduced the Rājās and Zamīndārs of the Carnatic.' He ruled from 1 Rabī-ul-awwāl, 760 A. H., (*i.e.*, 31 January, 1359 A. D.) to 9 Jī-ul-ka'dah, 777 A. H., (*i.e.*, 31 March, 1376 A. D.)[1] His wars with the kings of Teliṅgānā and Vijayanagar, and his suppression of the rebellion of Bahrām Khān Māzindarānī (Ferishta's Bairām Khān), governor of Daulatābād are the chief events of his reign.

According to Ferishta the order of Muhammad Shāh's campaigns is (1) his war with Vināyak Dēv, the

---

1. J. B. O. R. S., Vol. XXVI, p. 468 ; *vide*, table II also, p. 466.

son of the king of Telingānā who marched to Kaulas to wrest it from the Sultan ; (2) his expedition in 773 A. H., (1371-72 A. D.) to Vellumputtun ; (3) his subsequent invasion of Telingānā ; (4) his war with Vijayanagar in 767 A. H., (1365–66 A. D.) ; and (5) his quelling of the revolt of Bahrām Khān Māzindaranī of Daulatābād. But the order followed by 'Azīz-Ullāh Ṭabāṭabā and Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad is different. According to the former, the fourth campaign is the first, the second is the second, and the fifth is the third ; and according to the latter, the second campaign is the first, the fourth is the second, and the fifth is the third. We thus find that, with the exception of Ferishta, the other two authors did not describe all the campaigns of Muhammad Shāh I. The discrepancy regarding the order of campaigns, followed by the three chroniclers referred to above, is only seeming but not real. As far as they go there is agreement in the order, as will be made clear from the following discussion.

Of all the Muslim chroniclers Ferishta describes Muhammad Shāh's campaigns very elaborately and furnishes more details than the two other chroniclers whose accounts are very meagre though they all agree in the main. A perusal of these accounts convinces us that Ferishta went through many histories and collected more information than the other chroniclers; yet, confusion is obvious in his account. The dates he assigns to Muhammad Shāh's expedition to Vellumputtun and his war with Vijayanagar are not in conformity with the order followed by him in describing the campaigns. The date he assigns to the former event

is 773 A. H.,[2] and to the latter, 767 A. H.[3] There are some other statements in his account which will be pointed out in due course that make confusion very apparent. Let us now try to clear the account of this confusion and determine the order of the campaigns and their dates. It appears reasonable to take Ferishta's account as the basis of our discussion as it furnishes more details.

According to Ferishta, early in the reign of Muhammad Shāh the Rājas of Vijayanagar and Teliṅgānā demanded the restitution of the territories wrested from them by his father, and threatened to invade his dominions in case of refusal. Muhammad Shāh kept their ambassadors at his court and also sent his own ambassadors to their courts in order to gain time to make the necessary preparations for war. At the end of a period of eighteen months he demanded from them as his vassals the customary presents to be made to him on his accession to the throne. Enraged at this insulting counter-demand, the Rāja of Teliṅgānā sent his son, Vināyak Dēv to recover Kaulas from the Bahmanīs. The Rāja of Vijayanagar sent 20,000 horse in aid of Vināyak Dēv. In the beginning of this war Vināyak Dēv was successful in re-capturing Bhōnāgīr which was included in the dominion of 'Alā-ud-dīn Bahman Shāh. Later on, a big battle took place between Bahadūr Khān, the Bahmanī general and Vināyak Dēv, in which the latter was defeated and put to flight. Bahadūr Khān pursued the enemy as far as Warangal

2. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 301.

3. *Ibid*, p. 311.

and obliged him to conclude peace by paying a large sum of money, elephants, and jewels. This campaign is omitted both by Azīz-Ullāh and Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad.

The next campaign described by Ferishta is Muhammad Shāh's expedition to Vellumputtun. All the three authorities agree regarding the main points of this campaign. Ferishta describes this in more detail. Muhammad Shāh started from Gulbarga and marched to Kalyān. Thence he proceeded to Vellumputtun with a light detachment of four thousand cavalry with such rapidity that he arrived there within the space of a week. He sent in advance some of his soldiers to the town in the guise of horse-dealers "who had been plundered by robbers in order to amuse the attention of the guards at the gates."[4] While they were conversing with the guards the Sultan suddenly "*advanced with a thousand horse.*" By this strategy Muhammad Shah was able to get into the town easily and reduce the citadel.

As far as the above two campaigns are concerned there is no confusion. It exists only in the third and fourth campaigns described by Ferishta, that is, the war with Vijayanagar, and the revolt of Bahrām Khān Māzindaranī. Ferishta says that after his expedition to Vellumputtun Muhammad Shah next marched to Warangal to chastise the king of Teliṅgānā for the overtures he subsequently made to Sultan Fīrūz Shāh of Delhi, and after defeating him, forced him to conclude a treaty. After the conclusion of peace we are told that

4. *Ibid,*

the king of Telingānā presented to Muhammad Shah a beautiful throne, called later on 'Takht-i-Fīrōza'. He ascended it with due pomp, enlivened by music and dance and on that occasion gave a draft on the Vijayanagar treasury for remunerating the musicians. The refusal of the ruler of Vijayanagar to honour this draft led to the outbreak of hostilities between the two powers. Ferishta further informs us that, for leading this campaign, the troops in Berar and Bīdar were not yet ready because of the fatigues of a two year's campaign in Telingānā, and Muhammad Shāh therefore summoned Khān Muhammad with the division from Daulatābād. These statements clearly prove that the war with Vijayanagar was fought some time after the completion of the final campaign against Telingānā.

Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad's order is quite contrary to Ferishta's. After the expedition to Bilampatam,—Velamputtun of Ferishta, and Filampatam of 'Azīz-Ullāh—he describes the war with Vijayanagar and then the revolt of Bahrām Khān. According to him the war with Vijayanagar took place before the revolt of Bahrām Khān. Regarding the war with Vijayanagar he says that the king of Vijayanagar came by rapid marches to the country of Badhūl, and succeeded in seizing the fort. This might be Madhol on the river, Ghaṭaprabhā. Subsequently, on receiving information about Muhammad Shāh's rapid advance with an immense army the king of Vijayanagar fled, evidently from Badhūl, and took refuge in a strong fort, the name of which is not given. This might be the strong fortress of Mudkal of Ferishta's account which was later on invested by Muhammad Shāh. Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad's account of

the war with Vijayanagar closes with the defeat of the king of Vijayanagar and the re-capture of that fort.

On the other hand, Ferishta continues the account of the Vijayanagar campaign still further even after the re-capture of the fort of Mudkal. Yet, it may, in a way, be regarded as closed with this event; for, 'Muhammad Shāh', says Ferishta, 'regarding this victory as the omen of others, *after passing the rainy season near Moodkul, and being reinforced by Khān Mahomad from Dowlatābād*, marched against the infidels in Adony, on the plains of which place, near the Toongbudra, the Rāja of Beejanugger (after having fled from Mudkal) had taken up his station, having given the command of Adony to his sister's son." [5] The italics are mine. They furnish the clues to clear the confusion in Ferishta's account and settle the order of the campaigns.

According to Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad, Muhammad Shāh returned to Gulbarga after the recapture of the fort of Mudkal; but, according to Ferishta, he spent the rainy season at Mudkal. Even according to the latter Muhammad Shāh won a victory over the Vijayanagar ruler. He is said to have proceeded further into the Vijayanagar territory and laid siege to the fort of Adony. Moreover, Ferishta gives two different dates in his account about the war against Vijayanagar. This also indicates that there were two different campaigns against Vijayanagar on two different occasions, and that Ferishta hopelessly mixed up these two different campaigns into a single one in his account.

5. *Ibid*, p. 313.

This is definitely proved by some of the facts mentioned in the account given by Ferishta himself. According to him the Sultan waited for some time for his whole army to assemble to proceed against Vijayanagar. But, in the meantime, having heard the report of the capture of the fort of Mudkal and the massacre of the garrison therein by the king of Vijayanagar, the Sultan, " without waiting for the assemblage of his whole army began his march in the month of Jumad-ool-Awal, 767 A. H.," crossed the river Kṛṣṇā "*with nine thousand chosen horse*", and appeared before the fort of Mudkal. Only after the discomfiture of the Vijayanagar ruler, and the re-capture of that fort, did Khān Muhammad from Daulatābād join Muhammad Shāh with his troops after the rainy season.[6]

The reference to Khān Muhammad here is of inestimable value for the discussion in determining the order of Muhammad Shāh's campaigns. He was appointed governor of Daulatābād by Muhammad Shāh in succession to Bahrām Khān Māzindarānī, who was banished from the country after the suppression of his rebellion. The reference to Khān Muhammad in this context presupposes that the quelling of the revolt of Bahrām Khān was over, and that he was already the governor of Daulatābād by that time. He joined Muhammad Shāh with his forces only after the battle of Mudkal. It is necessary to point out here in this connection that Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad describes the rebellion of Bahrām Khān immediately after the Vijayanagar campaign. " A

6. *Ibid*,

long time had not elapsed after this (Vijayanagar campaign)," says he, "that swift messengers brought the news that Bahrām Khān and Gōvind Rāy had placed their feet outside the bounds of the road of obedience, and had scratched the face of loyalty and devotion with the finger nails of hostility "[7]. Can we accept this order to be the correct one ?

Ferishta himself inadvertently confirms this order when in course of his account of the rebellion of Bahrām Khān he refers to the reply of Muhammad Shāh to his ministers in defence of his advance against the enemy with only three hundred men. There Muhammad Shāh is reported to have said " that as he had penetrated into the very centre of Telingānā with only one thousand horse and punished his enemies, and that with only nine thousand men he had driven the hosts of Beejanugger to the hills and woods and returned successful, surely three hundred men were sufficient to cope with a few rebels." [8] It was in the battle of Mudkal, according to Ferishta that the Sultan had driven away the Vijayanagar armies " with nine thousand chosen horse." According to this passage the order of Muhammad Shāh's campaigns is as follows :—

(i) War with Telingānā (*i.e.*, Muhammad Shāh's expedition to Vellumputtun) ;

(ii) War with Vijayanagar (*i.e.*, the battle of Mudkal) ;

(iii) Suppression of the revolt of Bahrām Khān.

---

7. *Tabakāt-i-Akbarī*, Vol. III, p. 17.

8. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 322.

So, it is very clear that there was a campaign against Vijayanagar which was subsequent to the expedition to Vellumputtum and earlier even than the expedition to Daulatābād to suppress Bahrām Khān's revolt. After a brief stay in his capital after his return from the battle of Mudkal Muhammad Shāh proceeded to Dēvagiri or Daulatābād to quell the revolt there.

There is yet another piece of evidence to confirm that, of the three campaigns referred to above, the expedition to Daulatābād was later than that to Vijayanagar, that is, to Mudkal. The fortress of Mudkal did not so easily fall into the hands of the Sultan as Ferishta would have us believe. This is what Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad writes :

"The latter (*i.e.*, the Rāja of Vijayanagar) on receiving the information of the vast multitude of the Sultan's army, fled (from Badhūl), and took shelter in a strong fort (probably Mudkal). The Sultan sat round the fort for some days ; but when he saw that by doing so, the hand of his hope would not reach the skirt of success, he made an invalid of himself (*i.e.*, pretended that he had fallen ill), and returned towards Gulbarga. When he had crossed the Kṛṣṇā the Rāy opened the gates of the fort, and gave his men leave to go to their respective places. The Sultan making the Divine help the vanguard of his army, made a rapid march of eighty-one *karohs*, and presented himself in the neighbourhood of the fort; and with great activity and smartness fought with and defeated the Rāy" [9].

9. *Tabakāt-i-Akbari*, Vol. III, p. 16.

Ferishta in the course of his account concerning the revolt, alludes to Muhammad Shāh's "assumed illness" which "induced several adventurers to excite disturbances," of whom Bahrām Khān Māzindarānī was one.[10] But he wrongly refers to the Sultan's "assumed illness on his retreat from Vijayanagar" instead of from Mudkal. The above references from Ferishta's account itself convince us that the revolt of Bahrām Khān broke out immediately after the Vijayanagar campaign, and we have it from Ferishta that "Mahomed Shāh had not been above five days at his capital (after his return from the battle of Mudkal) when he was obliged to march to Daulatābād."[11]

Now, the order of two more campaigns—another war with Vijayanagar, and the campaign against Telingānā—has to be settled. It has been already pointed out at the beginning of the discussion about the Vijayanagar campaign that it was launched some time after the completion of the campaign against Telingānā[12]. Which is the Vijayanagar campaign referred to here, either the first or the second? Brigg's translation does not help us in determining this. But the Lucknow text of *Tārikh-i-Ferishta* furnishes the clue. Its version of the campaign against Telingānā which was reproduced elsewhere[13], furnishes one or two interesting facts which are not found in the text translated by Briggs.

This version supplies two important clues, namely, one is the date 764 A.H., in which year the Rāy of Tiling is said to have been plunged in sorrow at the

10. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 319.
11. *Ibid.*
12. See above p. 119.
13. See above p. 90.

death of his son; and the other is a reference to Khān Muhammad who was ordered by Muhammad Shāh 'with the intention of subduing Tiling' 'to collect the army of Daulatābād and encamp in the ghats above Daulatābād near the tank of Kutlugh Khān.' According to these statements we are led to believe that the revolt of Bahrām Khān was already quelled, and that Khān Muhammad was appointed governor of Daulatābād. It is therefore now clear that the campaign against Telingānā was undertaken after the suppression of the revolt of Bahrām Khān. Moreover, the capture of Vellumputtun and the murder of Vināyak Dēv, son of the king of Telingānā were events which had taken place before 764 A. H. It is therefore obvious that Ferishta's date 773 A. H., for the expedition of Vellumputtun is a mistake for 763 A. H. From 764 A. H., the king of Telingānā was attempting in vain to induce Fīrūz Shāh, emperor of Delhi, to invade the Bahmanī dominions. The report of the overtures with the emperor of Delhi made Muhammad Shāh burn with rage; and as a consequence he invaded Telingānā, laid waste the country and reduced the king to straits when he was compelled to sue for peace.

The second war with Vijayanagar was fought after the completion of this campaign; for Ferishta explicitly states that troops in Bidar and Berar had not yet rested from the fatigues of a two years' campaign (against Telingānā) and were not ready to invade Vijayanagar. According to him the Vijayanagar ruler's refusal to honour the draft sent by Muhammad Shāh on the Vijayanagar treasury was the cause of this second war with Vijayanagar.

In the light of the above discussion the order of the campaigns of Muḥammad Shāh may be settled as follows:

I. (*a*) First war with Telingānā, that is, war with Vināyak Dēv who proceeded to Kaulas to recover it from the Bahmanīs.

(*b*) Expedition to Velumputtun.

II. First war with Vijayanagar, that is, the battle of Mudkal.

III. Suppression of the revolt of Bahrām Khān Māzindarānī of Daulatābād.

IV. Second war with Telingānā.

V. Second War with Vijayanagar.

Niẓām-ud-dīn Aḥmad described the expedition to Velumputtun, first war with Vijayanagar, and the suppression of the revolt of Bahrām Khān. So, as far as it is given, the order of campaigns followed by him is correct. 'Azīz-Ullāh alludes to a war with Vijayanagar even before the expedition to Velumputtun and the 'first war with Vijayanagar'. This does not appear to be a regular war with Vijayanagar. The available evidence does not confirm this. In all probability it may be an allusion to the fight with the Vijayanagar forces which helped Vināyak Dēv in his attempt to wrest Kaulas from the Bahmanīs. The results arrived at from the discussion above, bear evidence to the remark made in the beginning of this paper that there is agreement among the three Muslim Chroniclers in the order of the campaigns followed by them.

Now, we have to determine the chronology of the campaigns. As stated already it is only Ferishta that assigns dates to some of the campaigns. According to the Lucknow text of *Tārikh-i-Ferishta* the date of the expedition to Velumputtun is 763 A.H. (that is, 1361-62 A.D.). It states " Finally in the year seven hundred and sixty-three 763 A. H., at the time when Sultan Muḥammad Shāh sitting in his chair was performing ablutions, it was brought to his notice that a company of merchants came bringing with them some horses etc."[14] Muḥammad Shāh set out on this expedition at the end of the year 763 A.H., that is, in the middle of 1362 A.D. We may, therefore, safely postulate that the first war with Vināyak Dēv was fought early in that year, that is, at the end of 1361 A.D. All the events connected with the expedition to Velumputtun were over by 764 A.H., (1362–63 A.D.); for Ferishta says that in the year seven hundred and sixty four 764 A. H., the Rāy of Tiling who was plunged in sorrow at the death of his son formerly and the devastation of his country, sent petitions to the court of Malik Fīrūz Shāh Bārbak, the emperor of Delhi. Muḥammad Shāh marched against Vijayanagar after 764 A.H.

Ferishta gives two dates[15] in his account of the Vijayanagar campaign, one is Jumad-Ool-Àwal 767 A.H., (that is January 1366 A.D.) and the other is 14 Zi-ul-ka'dah. He does not mention the year in the second date. The first date is the date of the first Vijayanagar

14. This passage also was translated for me by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya to whom my sincere thanks are due.

15. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 313.

campaign. Muḥammad Shāh proceeded against Vijayanagar in January 1366 A. D. Before this date the ruler of Vijayanagar came and captured some of the forts of the Bahmanī Sultans in the doab country between the rivers, Kṛṣṇā and the Tuṅgabhadrā. *Local Records* give the date of this expedition to the northern country as Śaka 1286 (1364-65 A. D., that is 766-67 A.H.). They state that Bukkarāya I, the ruler of Vijayanagar, went to war with the *yavanas* in the north.[16] According to the *Local Records* the victor was the Vijayanagar ruler; but according to the Muslim chronicles Muḥammad Shāh won a victory. Whatever the result of the war might have been, the date 767 A. H., for the first war with Vijayanagar may be accepted to be correct.

The next immediate campaign, the revolt of Bahrām Khān Māzindarānī broke out in the same year. It was in this year 767 A.H., when Sultan Fīrūz Shāh was about to march to Thatta from Gujarāt that Bahrām Khān sent his envoys with letters to his court soliciting him to recover the Deccan country and promising his aid and allegiance to the throne of Delhi.[17]

The next campaign is the (second) war with Telingānā. It took Muḥammad Shāh two complete years to bring the king of Telingānā to his knees, and force him to conclude peace. This means Muḥammad Shāh was

---

16. *Loc. Rec.*, Vol. XXXIX, pp. 5 and 6—నష్మిదొడ్డిపాళెయగాండ్లకై జీయతు.

17. E.D., Vol. III, p. 328.

engaged in Telingānā in the years 768 A. H., (1366-67 A. D.) and 769 A. H., (1367-68 A. D.). It was after the completion of this campaign that the second war with Vijayanagar was fought.

The date of the second war with Vijayanagar must be either 769 A. H., or 770 A. H. The second date [18] in the Vijayanagar account given by Ferishta without mentioning the year must refer to this second campaign against Vijayanagar. So, it must have been launched on 14th in the month of Zi-ul-ka'dah in the year either 769 or 770 A. H. The English date equivalents to 14 Zi-ul-ka'dah 769 and 770 A. H., are 1 July, 1368 A. D., and 20 June 1369 A. D., respectively.

The foregoing discussion tentatively settles the dates of the campaigns of the Bahmanī Sultan, Muḥammad Shāh I as shown below :—

1. War with Vināyak Dēv—in the beginning of 763 A.H.	
2. Expedition to Velumputtun—in the end of 763 A.H.	
3. First war with Vijayanagar—	767 A.H.
4. Revolt of Bahrām Khān—	767 A.H.
5. Campaign against Telingānā	768 } 769 } A.H.
6. Second war with Vijayanagar—	769–770 A.H.

18. Brigg's *Ferishta*, Vol. II, p. 314.

APPENDIX V.

(*a*) Genealogy of the Musunūri Nāyaks.

- Pōta
  - Pōca
    - Prōla*
    - Eṛa Pōta
  - Dēva
    - Kāpa*
    - Mummaḍi
  - Kāma
    - Immaḍi
    - Dēva
  - Rāja
    - Anavōta*

(*b*) Chronology of the Bahmanī Sultans of Gulbarga.†

(1) 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh	...	Aug. 3rd, 1347 A.D.—Jan. 31st, 1359 A.D.
(2) Muḥammad Shāh I	...	Jan. 31st, 1359 A.D.—Mar. 31st, 1376 A.D.
(3) Mujāhid Shāh	...	Mar. 31st, 1376 A.D.—April 16th, 1378 A.D.
(4) Dā'ūd Shāh	...	April 16th, 1378 A.D.—May 20th, 1378 A.D.
(5) Muḥammad Shāh II	...	May 20th, 1378 A.D.—April 25th, 1397 A.D.
(6) Ghiyās-ud-Dīn Shāh	...	April 25th, 1397 A.D.—June 14th, 1397 A.D.
(7) Shams-ud-Dīn Shāh	...	June 14th, 1397 A.D.—Nov. 15th, 1397 A.D.
(8) Fīrūz Shāh	...	Nov. 15th, 1397 A.D.—Sept. 22nd, 1422 A.D.

* Prōla and Kāpa were the liberators of the Coastal Andhra country and Telingānā respectively; the former was the donor of the undated Vilasa grant (Appendix No. I), and the latter, that of the Prōlavaram record dated in Śaka 1267 (Appendix No. III; *J.B.O.R.S.*, Vol. XX, (1934), pp. 260 ff; *Ep. Rep.*, 1934-35, para. 52; *Bhārati*, Vol. XI, pp. 939 ff.). Anavōta was the lord of Toyyēṛu.

† The above tentative scheme of the Chronology of the Bahmanī Sultans who ruled at Gulbarga, is taken from my article, *The Chronology of the Sultans of Gulbarga*, published in *J.B.O.R.S.*, Vol. XXVII (1941), pp. 455 ff.

INDEX

Adhyakṣas, state-officials, 43n.

'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh Bahmanī, first ruler of the Bahmanī Kingdom 78 ; defeated by Mallāreḍḍi 84 ; his death 84.

Amīrāni Ṣadah, their rebellion 75 ; result of the rebellion 78.

Anavōtā Nāyaka (Musunūri chief), cousin of Kāpaya Nāyaka 70 ; his capital Toyyēṛu 70.

Anavōtā Nāyaka (Rēcerla chief), son of Singama Nāyaka 95 ; his war against Kāpaya Nāyaka 96 ; his conquests 96 ; date of his Ainavolu record 98n.

Anitalli, Kaluvacēṛu grant of (Appendix II) and 111.

Andhra country, political condition at the time of the rise of the Kākatīya power 1 ; Muslim invasions 5 ; copper-plate grants recently discovered in the coastal 9 ; Muslim conquest of the coastal region of 17 ; confederacy of nobles of the coastal region of 31 ; the modern divisions of 36 ; date of the reconquest of the coastal region of 41.

Annaya, son of Gannaya Preggada, defended the fort of Warangal 11.

Annaya Mantri, commander of Pratāparudra defeated *yavanas* 11 ; his activities 25 ; received Ārēḍu from Kolani Rudradēva 42.

Anumakoṇḍa Viṣaya, feuḍal fief of the Kākatīya kings 1.

Arangal, see Warangal.

Bahmanī kingdom, its foundation 78.

Bidar, Capital of Western Telingānā 61.

Cintapalli Singama Nāyaka, brother-in-law of Singama Nāyaka (Rēcerla chief) 93 ; his ancestry 93n.

Gaṇapatidēva, his conquests 2 ; new spirit pervading in the Andhra country about his time 2.

Jājnagar, Ulūgh Khān's expedition to 14 ; its location 14n, 15.

Kākatīya kingdom, its limits 4.

Kampili, Kingdom of 47 ; outbreak of rebellion at 48.

Kāpaya Nāyaka (Musunūri chief), cousin and successor of Prōlaya Nāyaka 31n ; his early life 45, 46 ; ruler of Telingānā 56 ; account of his revolt 62, 63n ; different names of the leader of the Hindu rebellion according to the Muslim historians 55 ; discussion about the date of the Hindu rebellion at Warangal 67–69 ; his reign 70 ; defeated by Singama Nāyaka (Rēcerla chief) 74 ; helped Hasan 77 ; his treaty with 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh I 80 ; his efforts to avenge the death of his son 90 ; defeated by Muhammad Shāh I 91 ;

defeated and slain by Anavōtā Nāyaka (Rēcerla chief) 96 ; date of his death 97 ; his character 98–99.

Kolani Rudradēva, also called Pratāparudradēva, Commander of Pratāparudra, defeated Muslims 12 ; his title *Vyākaraṇa Brahma* 27n ; his achievements mentioned in *Śivayōgasāraṃ* 28–29 ; his Santa-Māgulūr inscription 40 ; his gift of the village of Ārēḍu 42 ; his latest date 43.

Kolanuvīḍu, ancient fortress in the Andhra country ; its history 26n.

Kōmaṭi Vēmāreḍḍi, another name of Prōlaya Vēmāreḍḍi 43 ; co-operated with Sōmadēvarāja (Aravīṭi chief) 51 ; subordinate of Kāpaya Nāyaka 72.

Mādā Nāyaka (Rēcerla chief) son of Singama Nāyaka and brother of Anavōtā Nāyaka 95.

Malik Bahā-ud-Dīn Gurshāsp, governor of Sagar, his rebellion 47.

Malik Fakhr-ud-Dīn Jūna, later known as Muhammad bin Tughlaq, leader of the first expedition against Warangal in the time of 'Alā-ud-Dīn Khaljī 5 ; entitled Ulūgh Khān before his accession to the throne 7.

Malik Nāib Kāfūr, general of 'Alā-ud-Dīn Khaljī, 5n, 6.

Mālyavanta, ancient name of (Pāpikoṇḍalu) Eastern Ghats in the East Godavary district 44.

Muhammad Shāh I, son and successor of 'Alā-ud-Dīn Hasan Shāh 84, 85 ; differences in the Muslim accounts of his campaigns 86n; his wars against Kāpaya Nāyaka 87 ; campaign against Velamputtan 88, 89 ; overran Telingānā 91.

Muslims, oppressive rule of 21–23 ; iconoclastic zeal of 23.

Nava Ballāḷas ; rebellion of 52 ; explanation of the term 52n.

Pratāparudra, last Kākatīya monarch 4 ; conclusion of peace with Malik Nāib Kāfūr 6; captive of war 8; number of wars he waged against Muslims according to the Vilasa grant 10; died on the banks of the Sōmōdbhavā (Narmadā) 11, 14 ; date of his death as furnished by the *Pratāpacaritra* 14n.

Pratāpacaritra, its account about the Muslim invasions of Telingānā 9.

Prōlaya Nāyaka (Musunūri chief), his Vilasa copper-plate grant 3n, 9, 20; leader of the confederacy of nobles 31 ; his forefathers, natives of Musunūru 33 ; freed the country of Tilinga (Andhra country) 35, 36, 38 ; ruled the seaboard of the Andhra country 43 ; his capital 44 ; his achievements 44, 45 ; his Vilasa Grant (Text-Appendix I) 100.

Rājamahēndravaram, Persian record of Sultan Ghiyās-ud-Dīn Tughlaq at 16 ; Alexander Rea's account of the mosque at 21.

Rēkapalli, capital of Prōlaya Nāyaka 44.

Sabbināṭirājya, 70.

Saiyid Jalāl-ud-Dīn Ahsan Shah, rebellion of 59.

Śārṅgapāṇidēva, vassal of the Kākatīya monarchs, his title indicative of his victory over the Turuskas 13 ; his Panugal record 13n.

Singama Nāyaka (Rēcerla chief) 25 ; his ancestors 29 ; defeated Kāpaya Nāyaka 74 ; his conquests 93 ; attacked the fort of Jallipalli 94 ; assassinated by Tamb ala Bammajiyya 95 ; his sons Anavōtā Nāyaka and Mādā Nāyaka 95.

Śivayōgasāram, an unpublished Telugu work 11n, 12n ; account of the Kolanu family furnished by 26.

Sōmadēvarāja, Aravīṭi chief 37 ; his rebellion and conquests 49, 51 ; probable date of his rebellion 50.

Telingānā, another name of the Andhra country 3n ; its extent during the Kākatīya rule 4 ; first Muslim invasion of 5 ; second Muslim invasion of 6 ; third Muslim invasion of 7 ; fourth Muslim invasion of 7 ; fifth Muslim invasion of 8 ; its annexation to the empire of Delhi 9 ; total number of Muslim invasions 9 ; one of the provinces of the empire of Delhi 18 ; Muslim rule in 20 ; modern division of the Andhra country 36 ; Muslim occupation of 37; its division into two administrative units 60; re-conquered by the Hindus 64; first Bahmanī invasion of 79; second Bahmanī invasion of 81 ; Muhammad Shāh's invasion of 91.

Telugu country, another name of the Andhra country—See Andhra country and Telingānā.

Tilinga, ancient name of the Andhra country 3n ; Tiling and Telingāṇā—other names of 4 ; See Andhra country and Telingānā.

Vēmā Reḍḍi, member of the Reḍḍi family of Addanki 31 ; his Mallavaram stone record 38, 43 ; his Madras Museum Plates 39n ; date of his Mallavaram record 39 ; his title *Rācūridurgavibhāḷa* 51. See Kōmati Vēmareḍḍi.

Vīnāyak Dev, son of Kāpaya Nāyaka 86 ; defeated by Muhammad Shāh I, 87 ; his death 89.

Warangal, description of 4 ; first Muslim invasion against 5 ; its fall 8 ; re-christened Sultānpūr 9 ; rebellion of the Hindus at 54 ; capital of eastern Telingānā 60 ; re-conquered by the Hidcus 66 ; capital of Kāpaya Nāyaka 70 ; conquered by Anavōtā Nāyaka (Rēcerla chief) 96.

Andhra University Publications

I. ENGLISH

(A) HUMANITIES AND SCIENCES

RAMALINGA REDDY SHASHTYABDAPURTI COMMEMORATION VOL. Part I—Sciences. (Rs. 10/-)
Do. Part II—Humanities. (Rs. 15/-)

(B) ECONOMICS AND POLITICS

No. 1. THE BEGINNINGS OF LOCAL TAXATION IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY—A STUDY IN INDIAN FINANCIAL POLICY—1863-71—by M. Venkatarangaiya, M.A., formerly Professor and Head of the Department of History, Economics and Politics, Andhra University, Guntur. (Rs. 2—4—0)

No. 4. THE WORLD ECONOMIC DEPRESSION—A PLEA FOR CO-OPERATION—by Sir J. C. Coyajee, B. A., LL. B., formerly Professor, Department of History, Economics and Politics, Andhra University. (Re. 0—12—0)

No. 5. INDIA AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS—by Sir J. C. Coyajee. (Rs. 2—4—0)

No. 12. FEDERALISM IN GOVERNMENT — by M. Venkatarangaiya, M.A. (Rs. 2/-)

No. 17. INDIAN POLITICS SINCE THE MUTINY —by Sir C. Y. Chintamani, Editor, 'Leader', Allahabad. (Rs. 2/-)

N. B.—Copies of English edition can be had from Messrs. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 40 Museum Street, London, W. C. 1. (Price 7 s. 6 d. net)

(C) HISTORY

No. 3. BUDDHIST REMAINS IN ANDHRA AND THE HISTORY OF ANDHRA BETWEEN 225 AND 610 A. D.—by Dr. K. R. Subrahmaniam, M.A., Ph.D., Principal, Maharajah's College, Vizianagram. (Rs. 2/-)

No. 19. MODERN CHINESE HISTORY (POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL)—by Prof. Tan Yun Shan (Chief Organizer, Sino—Indian Cultural Society, Nanking). (Re. 0—8—0)

No. 27. Advanced History of India by the late Prof. P. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar—Ed. by G. V. Rao, M. A., LL. B., Reader in History, Andhra University. (Rs. 8—8—0)

No. 32. A FORGOTTEN CHAPTER OF ANDHRA HISTORY—by M. Somasekhara Sarma, Department of History, Economics and Politics, Andhra University. (Rs. 2—0—0)

(D) PHILOSOPHY

No. 16. MAN—by Dr. Rabindranath Tagore. (Re. 1—0—0)

No. 24. Vivaranaprameya Sangraha (English Translation)—Edited by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri, M. A., B. SC., Bar-at-Law and Prof. Saileswar Sen, M.A., D.Litt., et., D. Phil. (Rs. 6—8—0)

(E) SCIENCE

No. 22. AN OUTLINE OF THE MINERAL RESOURCES OF ANDHRA DESA—by Dr. C. Mahadevan, M.A., D.Sc., Professor and Head of the Department of Geology, Andhra University. (Re. 0—8—0)

No. 23. SCATTERING OF LIGHT AND THE RAMAN EFFECT—by Prof. S. Bhagavantham, M.SC., Hon. D.SC. (Andhra), Andhra University. (Rs. 15—0—0)

No. 28. Intermediate Practical Physics — by V. Appa Rao, M.A., L.T. (Rs. 3—0—0)

No. 31. NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE ANDHRA AREA—A Symposium. (Rs. 2—8—0)

II. TELUGU

(A) CATALOGUES

No. 11. A DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE OF THE TELUGU MANUSCRIPTS IN THE TANJORE PALACE LIBRARY—Edited by P. P. S. Sastri, M.A., Govt. Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras. (Re. 1—8—0)

(B) CRITICISM

No. 8. KAVITHWATHATHWAVICHARAMU—by Sir C. Ramalinga Reddy, M.A. (Cantab), Hon. D. Litt. (Andhra), M.L.C., Vice-Chancellor, Andhra University, Guntur. (Re. 1—8—0)

(C) GRAMMAR

No. 15. VAIYAKARANA PARIJATAMU—by V. Ch. Sitaramaswami Sastri, formerly Pandit, University, College of Arts. (Rs. 3—0—0)

(D) LITERATURE

No. 2. THE UNIVERSITY LECTURES ON VEMANA—by R. Anantakrishna Sarma, Lecturer, Maharajah's College, Mysore. (Re. 0—12—0)

No. 10. HISTORY OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE—PART I VEDIC PERIOD (IN TELUGU)—by M. Suryanarayana Sastri, formerly Pandit, University College of Arts. (Rs. 2—4—0)

No. 13. HISTORY OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE—PART II LAUKIC PERIOD (IN TELUGU)—by the same author. (Rs. 2—4—0)

No. 18. HISTORY OF TELUGU LANGUAGE—by Dr.C. Narayana Rao, M.A., Ph.D., L.T., Lecturer, C. D. College, Anantapur (in two Volumes) Each Volume. (Rs. 6—0—0)

No. 21. VYASAMANJARI OR COLLECTED ESSAYS IN TELUGU—by Sir C. R. Reddy, M.A. (Cantab), M.L.C., Hon. D.Litt. (Andhra), Vice-Chancellor, Andhra University, Guntur. (Re. 1—8—0)

No. 29. Gona Budhareddy's Ranganatharamayanam—Edited by Veturi Prabhakara Sastri. (Rs. 7—8—0)

No. 30. DWIPADA BHARATAM—Vol. I—Edited by P. Lakshmikantam, M. A. (Rs. 10—0—0)

(E) PHILOSOPHY

No. 9. ANDHRA MIMAMSA NYAYA MUKTAVALI—(IN TELUGU)—A TREATISE ON PURVA MIMAMSA DARSANA—by K. Gopalakrishnamma, M.A., L.T., formerly Lecturer in Oriental Languages, Government Arts College, Rajahmundry. (Re. 1—8—0)

(F) SCIENCE

No. 14. VISWARUPAM—(dealing with the Physical Universe) written in popular Telugu—by K. Kondayya, M. SC., Chemistry Department, Benares Hindu University, Benares. (Rs. 2/-)

No. 20. TELUGU EQUIVALENTS OF TECHNICAL TERMS IN PHYSICS—by A. Balankeswara Rao, B. SC. (Hons.), Department of Physics, Andhra University. (Re. 0—12—0) (Inclusive of Postage)

Text-Book on Zoology and Physiology (in Telugu) —by R. V. Seshaiya, M.A., Annamalai University, Annamalainagar—(*in the Press*)

Text-Book on Trigonometry (in Telugu)—by K. Rangachari, M. A., B. L., M. R. College, Vizianagram (*in the Press*)

III. SANSKRIT

(A) VYAKARANA (Grammar)

No. 6. CHITRAPRABHA — A COMMENTARY ON HARIDIKSHITA'S LAGHUSABDARATNA — by B. Hari Sastri—Edited with notes by Mahamahopadhyaya Tata Subbaraya Sastri, Maharajah's Sanskrit College, Vizianagram. (Rs. 3/-).

No. 26. Guruprasadam and Guruprasadasesham —Edited by Mahamahopadhyaya Kalaprapurna Tata Subbaraya Sastri and Peri Venkateswara Sastri—Part I. (Rs. 7—8—0)
Do. Part II. (Rs. 10—0—0)

(B) NYAYA

No. 7. SANGAMESWARAKRODUM—ON JAGADISA'S SIDDHANTALAKSHANAM—by G. Sangameswara Sastri. (Re. 0—12—0)

(C) VEDANTA

No. 25. Vivaranaprameya Sangraha (Sanskrit Text)—Edited by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri, M.A., B.SC., Bar.-at-Law and Prof. Saileswar Sen, M.A., D.Litt., et., D.Phil. (Rs. 7—8—0)

Note—Copies of the above English and Sanskrit publications can be had from Kitabistan, Allahabad, U. P., and Telugu publications from Venkatarama & Co., Guntur.